

**Solzhenitsyn,  
the  
"Communist" Power  
and the  
Answer  
to the SALT Delusion**



HENDRIX COLLEGE LIBRARY  
947.084 Sp48s  
Spiro, George. 000  
Solzhenitsyn, the y/ communist y/ 010101  
  
0 2061 0053859 7

**George Spiro**

non-profit publication)

OLIN C. BAILEY LIBRARY

munist"

47.26

ORMAT

brary  
San I

6.7 3.32

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

ename=



947.084  
Sp485

The outstanding links in the contents of this work are:

1) the testimony of a victim of the Stalinist prison system; 2) the formation of the "Communist" State through the usurpation of power from the hands of the only authentic Soviet Government by the top Bolshevik leaders on November 7, 1917, the night of the overthrow of the Kerensky Capitalist regime; 3) the 1917-1922 struggle within the Bolshevik Party carried on against Lenin's policy of bureaucratism; 4) literary anti-Semitism in the "Communist" society since 1917; 5) Trotsky's support to Stalin; 6) the mad nuclear arms race between Capitalist United States and "Communist" Russia, threatening the destruction either of the Russian or the American population; 7) the program to forestall this frightful termination of the nuclear arms race through the abolition of both "Communist" and Capitalist systems of exploitation, elimination of all national rivalries and wars, the creation of a *genuine united nations under one international State*, and the building of a true Socialist society.

For many years the world outside the country known as the Soviet Union understood that it possessed a penal system not vastly different from the institutions of punishment maintained by other States. Although rumors of appalling conditions in Soviet prisons and labor camps circulated in the Capitalist world for decades, lack of direct communication with the inmates of the houses of detention prevented us from conclusively corroborating them. Suddenly there came forth a man, an outstanding Soviet writer, Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, who had suffered eleven years as a Soviet prisoner, with a book revealing the inside story of that system.

Writing it in strict secrecy, he disclosed its existence only to a few intimate friends, to whom he entrusted copies of the work. However, the Soviet police kept the writer and his close friends under surveillance. The authorities got wind of the contents of the hidden work, seized one of his friends, a woman, and for five days tortured her until she disclosed the place where she kept a copy of the manuscript. Released, she returned home and hanged herself.

In view of this development, Solzhenitsyn in haste, through secret means known to very few people in the Soviet Union, rushed the work abroad for publication.

The contents of the book, entitled *The Gulag Archipelago*, are so nightmarish as to stagger the mind. The picture it reveals, in the magnitude and in certain forms of physical torture, is much wider and more horrible than the primitive drama of Feudalism and the prison spectacle presented by Capitalism. Under Feudalism concocted charges were many. Women were accused of witchcraft, Jews were framed on false denunciations of murdering Christian children to use their blood in matzohs, for causing plagues and floods. But in the main the prisoners of Feudalism were violators of the landlords' property laws. Similarly, under Capitalism there have been frameups, the Dreyfus Affair, Mooney and Billings, Sacco and Vanzetti. Also there have been miscarriages of justice where people have been mistakenly imprisoned. But the overwhelming majority of convicts usually consists of robbers, thieves, rapists, murderers, embezzlers, prostitutes, and crooks of all kinds. In Russia there were miscarriages of justice before the Bolshevik Revolution, while a large number of the prisoners were of a common criminal variety, the political categories were actually anti-Tsarist activists, Anarchists, Social Revolutionists, Mensheviks,



Bolsheviks, Liberals, and non-partisan republicans. But in Stalin's Russia a different phenomenon occurred. A small minority in the penal institutions was of the criminal elements, but millions, and according to Solzhenitsyn's count, tens of millions were incriminated on concocted, or invalid charges, or on sweeping generalizations of guilt. Solzhenitsyn, an army officer, in a private letter to a friend, mildly criticized Stalin, without even naming him. Solzhenitsyn was arrested, and would have perished on one of the "islands" of the "archipelago," as millions before him, had it not been for the Tyrant's death and the campaign of de-Stalinization and mass rehabilitation carried out by Khrushchev.

Stalin terrorized the country from the very top to the lowest level of the population. He destroyed virtually the entire old leadership of the Bolshevik Party, all of its 1917 membership. His hangmen went through his bureaucracy with a violent, bloody storm. He decimated the working class, bled the peasantry, and brought millions of victims to "confess" to widely varied, never-committed crimes. In the process the executioners themselves were executed and replaced with newly-appointed mass murderers who, in turn, went down under the hail of bullets from Stalin's firing squads.

The off-stage tortures the Stalinist inquisitors applied to elicit "confessions" from their victims are eloquently described by Solzhenitsyn. Apart from beatings with rubber truncheons, the technique involved the dipping of the victim's face into a full cuspidor, urination into the open mouth, raising the temperature in the prisoner's cell until blood oozed out of the pores of his body, the dropping of cold water for many hours over the head and body—an ancient Chinese form of torture—electric shocks, and various other methods of physical and mental torment.

"But the most awful thing they can do with you is this: undress you from the waist down, place you on your back on the floor, pull your legs apart, seat assistants on them (from the glorious corps of sergeants!) who also hold down your arms; and then the interrogator (and women interrogators have not shrunk from this) stands between your legs and with the toe of his boot (or of her shoe) gradually, and with ever greater pressure crushes against the floor those organs which once made you a man. He looks into your eyes and repeats and repeats his questions or the betrayal he is urging on you. If he does not press down too quickly or just

a shade too powerfully, you still have fifteen seconds left in which to scream that you will confess to everything . . ." (Alexandr I. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, 127-8)

A distinct Stalinist instrument of torture was the bedbug box: "In the dark closet made of wooden planks, there were hundreds, maybe even thousands of bedbugs, which had been allowed to multiply. The guards removed the prisoner's jacket or field shirt, and immediately the hungry bedbugs assaulted him, crawling onto him from the walls or falling off the ceiling. At first he waged war with them strenuously, crushing them on his body and on the walls, suffocated by their stink. But after several hours he weakened and let them drink his blood without a murmur." (113)

Such tortures were not conceived even by the most inventive designers of pain-causing instruments in the days of Torquemada.

The Soviet administrators convulsed social life with forced marriages: "In 1944, another gaybist—state security officer—forced the daughter of an army general to marry him by threatening to arrest her father. The girl had a fiance, but to save her father she married the gaybist. She kept a diary during her brief marriage, gave it to her true love, and committed suicide." (151)

The bruises and wounds inflicted on the conscience of a human being by the Stalinist system of crawling before the dictator is presented in this picture:

"A district Party conference was under way in Moscow Province. It was presided over by a new secretary of the District Party Committee, replacing one recently arrested. At the conclusion of the conference, a tribute to Comrade Stalin was called for. Of course, everyone stood up (just as everyone had leaped to his feet during the conference at every mention of his name). The small hall echoed with 'stormy applause rising to an ovation.' For three minutes, four minutes, five minutes, the 'stormy applause, rising to an ovation' continued. But palms were getting sore and raised arms were already aching. And the older people were panting from exhaustion. It was becoming insufferably silly even to those who really adored Stalin. However, who would dare be the *first* to stop? The secretary of the District Committee could have done it. He was standing on the platform, and it was he who had just called for the ovation. But he was a newcomer. He had taken the place of a man who'd been



arrested. He was afraid! After all, NKVD men were standing in the hall applauding and watching to see *who* quit first! And in that obscure, small hall, unknown to the Leader, the applause went on—six, seven, eight minutes! They were done for! Their goose was cooked! They couldn't stop now till they collapsed with heart attacks! At the rear of the hall, which was crowded, they could of course cheat a bit, clap less frequently, less vigorously, not so eagerly—but up there with the presidium where everyone could see them? The director of the local paper factory, an independent and strong-minded man, stood with the presidium. Aware of all the falsity and all the impossibility of the situation, he still kept on applauding! Nine minutes! Ten! . . . Then, after eleven minutes, the director of the paper factory assumed a businesslike expression and sat down in his seat. And, oh, a miracle took place! Where had the universal, uninhibited, indescribable enthusiasm gone? To a man, everyone else stopped dead and sat down. . . . That same night the factory director was arrested. They easily pasted ten years on him on the pretext of something quite different. But after he had signed Form 206, the final document of interrogation, his interrogator reminded him: 'Don't ever be the first to stop applauding.' (69-70)

Soviet doctors played an important part at the scene of beatings of prisoners. "The beaten prisoner would come to on the floor only to hear the doctor's voice: 'You can continue, the pulse is normal!'" (208)

Case upon case, horror upon horror, has been piled by Solzhenitsyn to render an account of the carefully hidden side of the Stalin regime. In certain aspects the picture he draws is darker and bloodier than that of the Spanish Inquisition.

When this detailed inside story of Stalin's horrible penal institution was published in Paris, Leonid Brezhnev, the top leader of the Soviet Union, found himself in a dilemma. At first he seized the courageous writer and charged him with treason. This carried the death penalty. A storm of protest from many intellectuals in the Capitalist world broke loose. Brezhnev halted his process of "justice." He, evidently, had several considerations in mind. First, the book was published and was beyond his power of control. He could not stop it from breaking into English, French and other languages. Second, the execution of Solzhenitsyn would have only confirmed in the eyes of doubters the book's unusual authentic-

ity, would have unveiled before the world the brutal and oppressive nature of his regime, and would have turned the storm into a tremendous hurricane. The Soviet Union had become engaged in an apparently friendly detente with the United States, and the turbulent denunciations of his government might disorient American policy. And finally, the book, after all, was something of a spellbinder, carrying no social-political analysis of the step-by-step degeneration of the Bolshevik Party and the Stalinization of the Soviet institutions, no program of any sort, very little exposure of Brezhnev's policies, hence no direct, immediate threat to Brezhnev's power. In all probability, embracing all these considerations, Brezhnev decided, instead of imprisonment or execution to deport Solzhenitsyn abroad. In the middle of February 1974 he was flown out of the Soviet Union by the Soviet authorities.

In the *Gulag Archipelago* the total absence of any attempt at a political investigation is particularly felt with respect to the following questions: How did it happen that the Bolshevik Party, before the revolutionary storm of 1917, a small organization with insignificant influence among the masses, managed to grow after the abdication of the Tsar into a gigantic force, defeating at the polls in the great centers of Russia the political rivals, in the main, the Capitalist Kadets and their collaborators, the Mensheviks, and in Petrograd, the cradle of the Revolution, even the Social Revolutionists? What induced whole divisions of the Tsarist army, the Petrograd garrison to go over to the Bolsheviks? Why did the sailors of the entire Baltic Fleet place themselves at the head of the Bolshevik forces that overthrew the Capitalist Kerensky Government? What developments took place during and after the formation of the Bolshevik power that transformed the seemingly sterling Leninist leadership, a pleiade of self-sacrificing revolutionists, judging by its pre-power behavioral performance, its apparent dedication to the interests of the toiling people, into an assemblage of liars and murderers? How did Stalin, much more monstrous than Nero, than Genghis Khan, or Ivan the Terrible, secure personal control of all power in Russia and used it to commit more heinous crimes than did those other criminals?

\* \* \*

Following the abdication of the Tsar in March 1917, the workers in the factories of Petrograd, now Leningrad, and



the soldiers of the Petrograd garrison, held meetings and elected delegates to their councils, "Soviets" in Russian. At the same time certain Liberal members of the Tsarist parliament, called "Duma," formed a government and named it The Provisional Government.

Lenin was in Switzerland. Rejecting the Provisional Government as not the true representative of the Russian people, he declared: "The Soviets of the Workers and Soldiers Deputies is the embryo of a workers' government." (Letters from Afar)

He arrived in Petrograd on April 16 and immediately made public his Theses in which he stressed: "Not a parliamentary republic—to return to a parliamentary republic from the Soviet of Workers Deputies would be a retrograde step—but a republic of Soviets of Workers, Agricultural Laborers and Peasant Deputies throughout the country, from top to bottom."

The Petrograd Soviet, influenced by the Right-wing Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries who supported the Capitalist Provisional Government, ignored Lenin's theses. But even worse for him, he met rejection of his formula even in his Bolshevik Party.

Prior to Lenin's arrival, the Bolshevik paper, *Pravda*, was edited by Kamenev and Stalin whose line was critical support to the Provisional Government. At that time they were at an immense distance from accepting Lenin's view of turning the Soviets into a government. And even after all the Bolshevik leaders accepted Lenin's slogan, "All Power to the Soviets," none of them could see that behind this slogan lurked a terrible danger of an unprincipled personal dictatorship of one man.

The first Congress of Soviets of the entire country, meeting in June 1917, was dominated by Social Revolutionists and Mensheviks, with an insignificant Bolshevik minority opposing them. It rejected Lenin's position and continued rendering support to the Capitalist Provisional Government. But soon a few events transformed the political climate and brought the issue of power to a climax.

Under the suffocating pressure of the war against Germany conducted by the Provisional Government, coupled with the failure to settle the land question, and the surprising and very alarming attempt by General Kornilov to seize Petrograd, remove the Provisional Government, hang all the Soviet

deputies and thousands of workers, the Russian masses, after the arrest of Kornilov, shifted sharply to Lenin's line.

About two months later, on November 7, 1917, in Smolny Institute in Petrograd convened the Second Congress of the Soviets. The overwhelming majority of the delegates to the Congress had been elected on the basis of support to the central Bolshevik slogan All Power to the Soviets. The clear implication of the slogan was that not the leaders of the Bolshevik Party but the delegates to the Congress of the Soviets would set up a Soviet Government. And, indeed, having been called to order, the Second Congress assumed power at once, and issued a proclamatory statement to that effect:

"Supported by an overwhelming majority of the workers, soldiers and peasants, and basing itself on the victorious insurrection of the workers and the garrison of Petrograd, the Congress hereby resolves to take governmental power into its own hands." (*Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers Deputies*, in Russian, 93)

Before anything else, the proper issue facing the Congress, according to the promising rhetoric of the Bolshevik agitation, should have been the selection from the mass of delegates a suitable personnel to operate the State affairs. The Bolshevik leaders should have guided the assembly to open nominations from the floor for members of the governing body, to proceed with the discussion of fitness or unfitness of the nominees, to fix the terms of occupation of each office, and establish control from below, with the right, as Lenin had advocated, to recall unsuited figures exercising power.

But instead of this procedure, to have been followed by a set of recommendations to the thus elected Soviet power as to policy, something altogether different occurred. In the atmosphere of the yet unpersonal Soviet power, Lenin, Trotsky and a few other leaders of the Bolshevik Party met in private in one of the Smolny's side rooms, and, not a bit dismayed by their undeclared and unexpected action, organized *themselves* into a Cabinet, appending to each Minister the title "People's Commissar." They agreed to call the body "Soviet of People's Commissars," and distributed the posts of power among the members of this body. Lenin assigned himself the chair of the "Premier," Trotsky was named "People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs," Stalin was designated as "Commissar for Nationalities."

This was the initial moment of existence of the Bolshevik



State. The understanding of this beginning is indispensable in determining the nature of the newly-born Soviet regime and its policies.

Lenin and his small circle of closest collaborators acted in that backroom entirely on their own. No scope for any discussion of this private detail of setting up the government was offered by them either to the Congress or to the rank and file of the Bolshevik Party, the common soldiers of the Revolution. Not even the lower tier of leaders was consulted in the affair. Having organized themselves into a Soviet, having designated each to a post, setting no term of holding their specific offices, the few top leaders of the Bolshevik Party brought their slate to the Second Soviet Congress—not for examination but for approval, to become officially the Soviet Government.

Within the context of the struggle of the past several months, Lenin and his associates, in the eyes of the enthusiastic workers, sailors, soldiers and poorest of the peasantry, were great dramatic heroes fighting for a true representative workers government. With infinite confidence, they welcomed the unexpected turn. Their deputies let the power slip from the hands of the Second Congress of the Soviets into the hands of the top leaders of the Bolshevik Party.

The real significance of the event was missed by all, friend and foe. It was probably not clearly perceived by the new men in power themselves. But this seemingly honest beginning, covered with a bright red revolutionary paint, brought on a complex of unprecedented tragedies for the Russian, for the world masses, and was costly, even terrible to nearly all the Bolshevik leaders themselves.

What was the essence in Lenin's securing the approval by the Soviet Congress of the formation of the "Soviet of People's Commissars"? The intrinsic nature of his act was usurpation.

The fact that an administrative device was created which had never before been projected in the Bolshevik agitation, never even hinted at in the meetings of the Bolshevik Party membership, did not pass entirely unnoticed. A Bolshevik, Flerovskiy, later described an incident at the Soviet Congress: "My neighbor, Yarchuk, is in great excitement. 'What sort of a Soviet of Commissars? What kind of an invention is that? All power to the Soviets! Here on the spot there develops a hot dispute.'" (*Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, Oct. 1922, X, 146)

Yarchuk was right. Lenin's agitational slogan All Power to the Soviets was deeply planted in Yarchuk's mind. He supported it fully. And now he was clear to grasp that the "Commissars" who privately established a "Soviet" of their own to rule revolutionary Russia were neither workers, nor sailors, nor soldiers nor peasants. The Bolshevik top leaders were not bona fide delegates to the Second Congress of the Soviets, because they were not elected in the factories, or in the army units, nor on the ships. Lenin upon arrival in Russia from Switzerland did not enter a shop or a plant where, being a worker, he could have been chosen as a delegate to the Petrograd Soviet. Trotsky on May 17 came to Petrograd from a detention by Canadian authorities. He too never entered a factory as a worker. Stalin returned from Siberian exile and became editor of *Pravda*. As to posts in the government of the future, there is no evidence to show that any of them, even Stalin, in the first weeks after the fall of the monarchy, sought personal power. For several months they performed the role of advisers to the working class, illuminators of the imperialist essence of the war, eventually becoming the leaders in the overthrow of the Kerensky regime. But their personal assumption of power transcended the role of advisers, and was not jibing in any way with the slogan of "All Power to the Soviets." By affixing to his power-circle the title "Soviet," an obviously artificial concoction, as Yarchuk clearly perceived, Lenin took the first step in starting the macabre development of rivalry among the top Party leaders for personal prestige and gave birth to an insatiable lust for power and privilege.

There were Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists at the Congress, many of them also not workers, or soldiers, or peasants. They were in a split among themselves. Their Left groups leaned toward the Bolsheviks, the Rights walked out. Trotsky gave a fiery speech, telling the withdrawing Rights to go into the garbage pail of history. But his remarks contained an extremely false note with respect to the new power:

"Openly and before the face of the whole people we raised the banner of insurrection. The political formula of this insurrection was: All Power to the Soviets—through the Congress of Soviets. . . . We as a party considered this our task: to make it genuinely possible for Congress of Soviets to seize the power . . . a party was needed which would wrench the power from the hands of the counter-revolution and say to



you: 'Here is the power and you've got to take it!' (Stormy and prolonged applause.)" (Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, III, 339)

In this *History* Trotsky shows that the Russian masses, though they finally accepted the Bolshevik slogan, made a clear separation between the Soviets and Lenin's Party. Indeed, the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd and in the provinces openly declared that they would not come out for insurrection at the call of the Bolshevik Party, but would come out if summoned by the Soviets: "At a conference of October 16th in Petrograd, Boky made this report in the name of the party committee: In the Moscow district 'they will come out at the summons of the Soviet, but not of the party'; in the Nevsky district 'All will follow the Soviet.' Volodarsky thereupon summarized the state of mind in Petrograd in the following words: 'The general impressions is that nobody is eager to go into the streets, but all will appear at the call of the Soviet' . . . The grenadier regiment even declared that it would come out only at the command of the Congress of Soviets. The very fact that agitators and organizers, in estimating the state of mind of the masses, always alluded to the distinction between the Soviet and the party, shows what great significance this question had from the standpoint of summons to insurrection. . . . Attempts to lead the insurrection directly through the party nowhere produced results." (III, 283)

This survey indicates quite plainly that the broad Russian masses only indirectly accepted Lenin's personal guidance in the unmutated line of transferring all power to the Soviet institution. Had he openly stated that the passing of power to the Soviets would be a mere formality immediately superseded by the assumption of all control by the Party leadership, they would not have acquiesced to that.

Investigating the whole matter deeper, one gets the scent of demagoguery in Lenin's call for "All Power to the Soviets." It appears that while writing article after article to provide that the Soviet is the historical structure for the proletarian government, not the Party, he carried in the back of his mind all along the thought of putting not the Soviets but the Party, actually its leaders, actually himself, in the seat of power. Trotsky records the following episode: "At the first Congress of the Soviets on June 4, Tseretelli during his speech remarked in passing: 'In Russia at the present moment there is not

one political party which would say, Give us the power in our hands.' At that moment a voice was heard from the benches: 'There is!' Lenin did not like to interrupt orators, and did not like to be interrupted. Only serious considerations could have impelled him to abandon on that occasion his customary restraint." (I, Appendix III, 479)

And Trotsky, further, cites Lenin's explanation:

"In a speech at that same session Lenin explained his reply from the benches: 'The Citizen Minister of Posts and Telegraph (Tseretelli) said that there is no political party in Russia which would express its readiness to take upon itself the whole power. I answer there is. No party can decline to do that, and our party does not decline. It is ready at any minute to take the whole power.'" (Ibid.)

Apparently no one in 1917, and for many years after, noticed that immediately upon the fall of the monarchy, Lenin laid heavy stress on transferring all power to the Soviets, but at the First Congress of the Soviets, curiously enough, he dismissed completely all thought of factual investment of the Soviets with administrative authority. The July and the August events, the new defeat of the Russian army at the Front, the Kornilov threat, overshadowed the First Congress, and the Bolsheviks, offering the "All Power to the Soviets" perspective, with billions of words inundated Lenin's two-minute explanation in favor of taking power—the whole power—by the Bolshevik Party, in full color, by the top Party leaders. But his brief remark at the First Congress of the Soviets clearly shows what was in the back of his mind before and during the Second Congress of the Soviets.

Following his dramatically open explanation on June 4, 1917 at the First Congress of Soviets, Lenin never repeated his overriding purpose behind the mind-catching slogan "All Power to the Soviets." Obviously when, on November 7, the Soviet power took shape and publicly asserted by the Second Congress of Soviets, Lenin, with the concept of the takeover by him personally implanted deeply in his mind, projected forth his drastic deviation from his popular slogan. This is the inside story of the original transfer of power by Lenin in a back-room machination from the Soviet institution into the hands of the top leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

One of the first pressing issues the "Soviet of People's Commissars" faced immediately upon its formation was the armed conflict with Kaiser Germany. Several months back,



Lenin had written: "Let the German capitalist bandits together with their crowned murderer Wilhelm know that we will enter into no negotiations with them." (*Pravda*, June 20, 1917). In the Resolution of the All-Russian Party Conference Lenin and the rest of the leaders declared: "The Conference emphatically protests against the vile slander spread by the Capitalists against our Party to the effect that we favor a separate peace with Germany." But after personally securing the helm of power Lenin plunged into direct negotiations for a separate peace with the Kaiser, thus reneging on all his recent declarations.

Prior to the Bolshevik overthrow of the Kerensky-led Provisional Government, and during the first days of the Lenin regime, the Russian and the German soldiers facing each other on the Eastern Front unfolded a solid and seemingly enduring fraternization. Despite the language barrier, one word was understood by both sides: "Revolution!" Kerensky, bent on continuing the war, stood strikingly helpless before the fraternization movement. But patently helpless as well before this breakdown of the German military discipline was Kaiser Wilhelm. "The German command took a whole series of most atrocious measures against fraternization, to the extent of death penalty, but was unable to stop it." (*Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, Russian, VII, 38)

Before he took power, Lenin had written on the subject of fraternization: "It is obvious that fraternization is a road to peace. It is obvious that this road leads not to the capitalist governments, not to harmony with them, but, on the contrary, it leads against them." And he concluded: "Long live fraternization! Long live the rising world Socialist revolution of the proletariat!" (*Pravda*, May 11, 1917; *Collected Works*, XX, Bk 2, 13)

The Kaiser command agreed to negotiate with Lenin on one *indispensable* condition, that the Bolsheviks, now in control of the Russian Army, liquidate the fraternization activity of the soldiers. What the German command itself was unable to accomplish, even by applying the death penalty, it asked Lenin to do. In response, Lenin's newly-appointed Commander-in-Chief, Krylenko, ordered that "fraternization be halted at once along the entire front." (*Izvestia*, Nov. 28, 1917)

Henceforth the lines where the Russian and the German soldiers united in friendly handshakes became empty. Lenin and the Kaiser sent representatives to open peace negotia-

tions at Brest Litovsk.

When Lenin was in Switzerland he laid down the policy of revolutionary war for the Soviet to follow: "the Soviet of Workers Deputies, in my opinion, would agree to wage war against any bourgeois government and against all bourgeois governments of the world." (Letter from Zurich, Col. Wks. XX, Bk 1, 61)

But now, after establishing himself in power, Lenin decided upon an opposite course. With cool accuracy he realized that Germany, as well as France, were both growing ripe for revolution. Attempts at fraternization on the Western Front had been reported as far back as two years before. And since brilliant usurpers develop a marvellous sensitivity to danger to their personal power, he felt threatened by his former revolutionary position. To start a revolutionary war against the Kaiser meant not only to extend fraternization from the Russian to the French Front but to let the German revolutionary soldiers to elect from their midst a commanding personnel to lead them in a march upon Berlin. In this luminous for him moment, Lenin realized that a successful workers revolution in Germany, the most industrialized country in Europe, would have immediately shifted the revolutionary center away from the semi-backward peasant Russia into the heart of industrial Europe. Lenin decided upon a separate peace with "the German Capitalist bandits together with their crowned murderer Wilhelm," facing a strong opposition from several secondary leaders of the Bolshevik Party.

The "peace" that Lenin secured did not stop the Kaiser from advancing his troops into Russia, from occupying the Ukraine, and from carrying off into Germany an incredible abundance of raw materials, grain and other food products. The population of Russia, a few weeks after the Bolsheviks put their signatures to the Brest-Litovsk "peace" treaty, faced a frightful shortage of the simplest commodities.

The Kaiser's sudden, immense, ever-expanding victory in Russia, due exclusively to Lenin's suppression of fraternization, excited the German military caste. Believing that now a total victory in the war, over France and England, was possible, the German high command on March 21, 1918 opened a tremendous drive on the Western Front. Blood was running in rivers. The flower of the French, British and German working class was perishing for imperialist causes. But the powerful drive was stopped. About three weeks later,



on April 9 the second, even mightier offensive was opened by the Kaiser's generals. That too was halted. Concentrating more forces, bringing some regiments from Russia, the German command on May 27 unfolded a third frightful attempt to break through to Paris; on June 9 the fourth; on July 15 the last. Nearly a million lives were lost in these terrible battles.

On July 18, sustained primarily by the newly-arrived American army, which rendered a larger dimension of strength to the French and British, was opened an Allied counteroffensive. It continued for about four months, until the fall of the German Empire. The power in Germany was taken over by the Social Democrats, who not only retained and protected German Capitalism, but kept intact the Kaiser's military caste.

Had Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and the rest of the top Bolshevik leaders refrained from usurping power from the Congress of the Soviets, had they maintained Lenin's position on fraternization and issued a universal appeal to the soldiers of all warring parties to fraternize, had they pressed forth Lenin's position on revolutionary war, the history of both Russia and Germany would not have been curved toward the two most brutal tyrants in history, Stalin and Hitler.

Quite conscious that to shield his prerogatives and have his dictates carried out in life, Lenin had to rely on sycophants subservient only to persons in high office. Hence he from the start introduced a system of appointments and dismissals, thus constructing a State bureaucracy. This too was a violation of his own principle of creating a workers State with an administration by elected officials and the right of recalling unsuitable officials. However, in this course, as on the issue of negotiations with the Kaiser's generals, Lenin met a determined opposition from certain Bolshevik leaders. Among the first who opposed the policy of building a bureaucracy and "peace" negotiations was a woman Bolshevik, Alexandra Kollontai, with whom Lenin, when in Switzerland, had carried on a friendly political correspondence. Then there were the Left Communists led by Bukharin who also put up a struggle against bureaucratization and for a revolutionary war against Germany. Incidentally, Germany, after the Russian sailors and workers toppled the Kerensky Government, was a simmering cauldron. On January 7, 1918 the German sailors at Kiel rose in rebellion. On January 30 the workers in the

war industries in Berlin, Hamburg and Essen went on strike. There were demonstrations against the Kaiser government.

Bureaucratization continued unabated, and in a year had reached monstrous proportions. The Eighth Party Congress (March 18-23, 1919) provides an insight into the depth of this phenomenon to which the ruling set descended. One of the leading oppositionists, Saprnov, called the attention of the Congress to the fact that Lenin's policy did not correspond to the programmatic declarations of the Party. "Our Program speaks of conducting a struggle against bureaucratism, a struggle against officialdom, etc. Yet reality and the policy which is being carried out in life do not correspond to what is written in the Program and in every one of our resolutions. Officials are appointed from above and are dispatched to the localities." (*Stenographic Report of the Eighth Party Congress*, in Russian, 272)

A shocking picture of corruption and depravity of the Bolshevik Party, the Party headed by Lenin, not yet by Stalin, was drawn by delegate Nogin: "Our Party has deteriorated, the functionaries in localities and in the center conduct themselves in such a way as to disgrace the name of the Party . . . we received such an endless number of horrifying facts about drunkenness, debauchery, graft, brigandry, and senseless actions on the part of many functionaries that our hair stood on end." (145)

Some of Lenin's associates in power were constrained to pretend agreement with the critics. Zinoviev, Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, revealed:

"Many people know that in some places in the provinces and sometimes in big centers, the reform in the realm of the housing question was reduced to the situation wherein the houses were taken from the bourgeoisie and handed over not to the workers but to the Soviet officials. And at times those houses were given not only to the Soviet bureaucrat but also to his grandmothers, his aunts and godfathers. (Voices: Shame! Shame!)"

Lenin's 1917 promise of giving empty houses of the aristocracy and the Capitalists to the homeless workers, of milk to the starving children of the workers had won the hearts and minds of millions of the masses. After a while, as he built his power, Lenin pampered only his bureaucracy, showering upon it whatever luxury there was. The workers' families were starving, the top Party bureaucrats held banquets in



the former Tsar's palaces.

A sharp convulsion in the Bolshevik Party against Lenin occurred about a year later, at the Ninth Congress of the Bolshevik, or Communist Party held from March 28 to April 4, 1920. The main opposition group was headed by Osinsky, Smirnov and Sapronov, who called their organized body Democratic Centralists. Against a barrage of accusations by Lenin's supporters, they were impelled to defend themselves, particularly against the insinuation that their tendency advanced Menshevik ideas. Thus, Oppositionist Maximovsky protested: "We are not children, and you need not tell us that we are defending Menshevik views. . . . We are defending democratic centralism in building the organs of Soviet power." (*Sten. Rep.* 41)

Maximovsky went to the length of comparing the Bolshevik Party to a putrid fish, and hinted broadly that the putrescence began with Lenin: "Fish are said to begin to putrify from the head downwards. . . . The Party is beginning to suffer at the top from the influence of bureaucratic centralism." (*Ibid.*)

Maximovsky overlooked the fact that within the previous two years and four months, beginning during the night of the formation of the "Soviet of People's Commissars," the Bolshevik Party, distinguished before that event as an organization sincere in its devotion to the working class, was in a state of progressive decay. In plain, since its top leaders arrogated power to themselves, the Party history became a rich storehouse of bureaucratic abuse and corruption.

Because the majority of the delegates to the Ninth Party Congress were "elected" and moulded by Lenin's apparatus with the benefit of an easy technique of large publicity, of individual pressure at the worker's job, and the villainy in the daily life of the Party members, the Oppositionists failed to influence the gathering.

A year passed. Bureaucratic degeneration of the Bolshevik Party, corruption in the State institutions, assumed alarming proportions—alarming not to Lenin and his ruling coterie but to the sincere, revolutionary part of the working class. Simultaneously grew the opposition tendencies in the Party.

The height of the anti-Lenin crisis not only in the Party but even more serious, in the armed forces, was reached in the period of the Tenth Party Congress in March 1921. The sailors of the Baltic Fleet, in Kronstadt, rose in an open anti-

Lenin rebellion. They were not the sailors of the October Revolution, who sent Yarchuk as their representative to the Second Congress of the Soviets—those perished on the numerous fronts of the Civil War. The men who took their place on the ships, however, not long before the mutiny had been loyal supporters of Lenin and turned a deaf ear to the Opposition. But they were dismayed by Lenin's bureaucratic excesses, and finally swung away from the Bolshevik Party in the direction of Left Socialist Revolutionists who leaned toward Capitalism. The Kronstadt rebellion was brutally put down by Trotsky.

But inside the Tenth Party Congress Lenin faced a situation replete with a real threat to his system of bureaucratic control of the State. The anti-Lenin groups, the Democratic Centralists, and particularly the Workers Opposition led by that vigorous, defiant woman, Alexandra Kollontai, and by a courageous metal worker, A. G. Shliapnikov, opened a powerful offensive for internal democracy in the Party.

In preparation for the Congress, Kollontai wrote a pamphlet *The Workers Opposition in the Russian Communist Party*. To maintain a semblance of democratic procedure, Lenin allowed the pamphlet printed by the State for general distribution among the Party membership. On the cover the printshop stated that the issue was published in 1,500,000 copies. This implied that the pamphlet would freely reach all the 732,521 members of the Party. However, not even every member of the Workers Opposition, which numbered about 60,000, secured a copy. The reason for this amazing circumstance was explained at the Congress by Kollontai:

"On the cover of the pamphlet '*The Workers Opposition*' issued by the State publishing department it is stated that the number of copies printed is one million five hundred thousand. In other words, there were added three zeroes which give the impression that the pamphlet '*The Workers Opposition*' has been widely circulated, far greater than the circulation of any official pamphlets. In reality, the pamphlet was printed only in 1,500 copies, and printed with hindrances at that." (*Sten. Rep. of the Tenth Party Congress*, Russ. 54)

The pamphlet had many shortcomings. There was not a mention of the original usurpation of power by Lenin from the Second Congress of Soviets on the night of the overthrow of the Kerensky Government, not a word about Lenin's disruption of the great fraternization of the Russian and the



German soldiers. The 1917 position of the Party against bureaucracy and for election of officials was forgotten. The pamphlet did not confront the top leaders squarely with the disclosure that the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" was demagogically seized upon by them to mask the personal abuse of power, a cold inevitability under the process of appointments. Neither did the pamphlet bring into focus the fact that the Lenin regime was based on the principle of male supremacy.

But the pamphlet had plenty to say against the current Lenin-guided bureaucracy, grinding away at this prominent side of Soviet reality.

The Tenth Congress opened on March 8, 1921. The political atmosphere was tense with undefined expectations. Lenin's keynote address contained a distinct threat to suppress the discussion of his policies. "The controversial atmosphere is becoming extremely dangerous, it is becoming a positive menace to the dictatorship of the proletariat."

To besmirch the Workers Opposition and thus strengthen his attack on its demand for curbing the bureaucracy, Lenin denounced its program as "an anarcho-syndicalist deviation."

Kollontai in simple language advanced the line of the Workers Opposition on workers democracy: "We must have a system of a widely unfolding democracy, confidence in the masses, and a guarantee of freedom of opinion for comrades, not only on paper but in fact." (165)

The speeches of Lenin, Trotsky and other top leaders were duly and in full entered into the official record; the short remarks of the Oppositionists were only partly recorded in the *Stenographic Report*. But some of the critical observations of the Oppositionists can be detected by a researcher in the speeches of the Leninists who quote them. Lenin's Central Committee was charged with dishonesty, with covering up bureaucratic rotteness in the Party, with disseminating corruption within the working class.

Lenin laid down at the Congress a peremptory line against all oppositions: "We need now no opposition, comrades! And I think the Party Congress will have to draw the conclusion that for the opposition this must be the end. A lid must be clamped down on the opposition. We have had enough of oppositions!" (63)

Lenin came to the Congress armed with a resolution "On Unity." The resolution stated: "The Congress therefore de-

clares dissolved and orders the immediate dissolution of all groups without exception that have been formed on the basis of various platforms (such as 'Workers Opposition' group, the 'Democratic Centralism' group, etc.). Non-compliance with this order of the Congress must involve unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party."

The Oppositionists greeted Lenin's resolution on "unity" with scorn and undisguised disgust. Shliapnikov declared: "In all my life, in the twenty years of my being in the Party, I have not seen and have not heard anything more demagogic, anything which more perverted the facts than this resolution." (287)

Lenin's reaction to the fiery indignation of the Oppositionists was a calm, masterful stroke of shrewdness. He had Shliapnikov and other Opposition leaders "elected" to the Central Committee of the Party in which Lenin enjoyed undisputed control. The Oppositionists understood the clever maneuver. Shliapnikov and others would be used as window-dressing to lend that bureaucratic body an outwardly democratic appearance. Without a moment's hesitation, Shliapnikov declined to accept the honor. Thereupon Lenin introduced a new resolution which said: "The Congress . . . rejects the resignation of Comrade Shliapnikov or any other resignation." (291)

In the process of his bureaucratization, Lenin became a keen manipulator of plots to accomplish his purpose.

Between the Tenth Congress of the Party and the Eleventh a year later, was a period of hounding and weeding out the Oppositionists. When an Opposition member in a Party unit would take the floor in any discussion, not even touching upon the subject of bureaucracy, he would be shouted down by a Lenin machineman, called "anarcho-syndicalist," and frequently was denounced as an Oppositionist and expelled. Nevertheless, despite the repression a few of the Opposition leaders were elected to the Eleventh Congress.

They revealed much. Oppositionist Kossioz related how the brutal ruling set persecuted the Party members who found within themselves enough daring to voice a measure of criticism of the official policy: "When anyone had the courage and considered it necessary to come out with criticism or point out this or that shortcoming which we have in the domain of Soviet and Party building, he was immediately branded as an oppositionist and was reported to proper authorities, and such a comrade was removed." (*Sten. Rep.*



of the Eleventh Party Congress, Rus. 113) All the delegates knew the fatal meaning of the word "removed." It signified that the critic was expelled from the Party, removed from his job, thrown out of his apartment with his wife and children, and thus driven to perish in the streets of cold, hunger and disease.

Shliapnikov was present. He called attention to Lenin's threat against the Oppositionists: "Yesterday Vladimir Il'yitch said here that we spread panic and that with people who spread panic it is necessary to struggle with machine gun fire." (91)

Baring the punitive forms of his apparatus, Lenin set up a commission to liquidate all opposition to his rule. He placed Stalin in charge of this body. The leaders of the opposition were disposed of by shifting them to different localities. Shliapnikov was sent to a job in Siberia. Kollontai was ordered to Norway on a diplomatic mission. Intimidated not so much by personal mistreatment as by the wave of terror against her rank and file followers, she soon folded up, and gradually rotted away to become, eventually, a loyal Stalinist.

The Eleventh Party Congress marked a sharp turn for the substantial rise of Stalin's power. All along Stalin, having become a perfect hatchetman, had been Lenin's favorite. Ever since Lenin had placed him in the circle of the "Soviet of People's Commissars" there was nothing but promotion. In addition to being a member of the Central Committee of the Party, a member of its powerful Politburo, he became the head of Orgburo, a post which provided him with the opportunity to build a pyramid of servile friends and lackeys of his own through the system of appointment. But that was not all. At the Eleventh Congress, in March-April 1922 Lenin created a special post of absolute authority, the General Secretary of the Party, and had Stalin "elected" to that post.

From that time on, with every passing day, Stalin grew not only more powerful but also more arrogant and vain.

Lenin fell ill, and while recuperating, he learned from the people around him that Stalin had been excessively rude to other leaders, and more than that, abusive to Lenin's wife, Krupskaya. Moreover, Lenin observed that Stalin stood now at the crest of a bureaucratic pyramid of his own, built behind Lenin's back. This particular development warranted Lenin's urgent and immediate attention. As if in a flash, the consequence of Stalin's holding the Party and the State in

his grip became starkly visible to the founder of the Bolshevik power. He was spurred to action. He dictated a letter to his secretary, eventually known as his testament, in which he urged the forthcoming Twelfth Congress of the Party to put up a battle for the removal of Stalin from power. In addition, he appealed to Trotsky, who was not a member of the Stalin clan, to lead the fight against the General Secretary.

A word is in place here to describe Lenin's condition. On December 16, 1922 Lenin suffered a stroke, the second one, which ended his public participation in the affairs of the State. On December 25 he dictated the Testament, and on January 4, 1923 he added a postscript advising the removal of Stalin. On March 7 he appealed to Trotsky for help against Stalin. Two days later the third stroke rendered his condition virtually hopeless. He died on January 21, 1924. Many years later, Trotsky in Mexico wrote an article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" published in a Capitalist magazine *Liberty* (Aug. 10, 1940). In all probability Stalin did, but no proof of that alleged murder has been unearthed—not yet.

The Testament and other of Lenin's documents directed against Stalin were dispatched by their author to the Central Committee of the Party dominated by Stalin. All the members of this high organ, including Trotsky, knew of these documents. The Central Committee concealed the Testament and other anti-Stalin messages, but some years following many involved events Stalin read the most important part of the Testament for open publication:

"It has been said that in this 'Testament' Comrade Lenin suggested to the Congress that it weigh the question of replacing Stalin in the post of General Secretary with another comrade. This is perfectly true. Let us read this passage although it has been read at the Plenum several times. Here it is: 'Stalin is too rude, and this fault, quite tolerable in our own midst and in the relations among Communists, becomes intolerable in the post of General Secretary. I therefore propose that the comrades think about a method of removing Stalin from this post. . . .'" (*Pravda*, Nov. 2, 1927)

Why Stalin, after more than four years of concealing the Testament, publicly revealed Lenin's line against him will be shown later in this work.

Toward the closing weeks of 1922 Stalin and his thievish coterie had little to fear from the incapacitated Lenin. The center of their anxiety was Trotsky. A man who at certain



moments outshone even Lenin's popularity, Trotsky was the giant of the Russian Revolution, almost an equal of Lenin. He was the best orator in the Party. He was the man who, even according to Stalin, won over the Petrograd garrison to the slogan All Power to the Soviets. It was Trotsky who organized the sailors-workers-soldiers insurrection which overthrew the Kerensky regime. He organized the Red Army and directed the military struggle until the final victory over the White Armies and the international Capitalist intervention. Trotsky towered over Stalin and over all of Stalin's associates. He stood independently alone, though surrounded by numerous friends. Stalin, naturally, asked himself, was Trotsky getting dangerously ready to mold Lenin's line into reality and, before the eyes of the entire Party, and the world, arrange at the Twelfth Congress for Stalin's removal?

In the past Stalin had occasionally evinced a repellant behavior toward the brilliant Trotsky. In the sphere of the Civil War they had significant confrontations with each other, often settled by Lenin in Stalin's favor. Would that affect Trotsky's attitude toward Stalin, now that Trotsky was armed with Lenin's confidential trust and possessed a copy of the Testament, as all the other top leaders of the Party? Holding down his antipathy, Stalin, very apprehensive, sent one of his closest confederates, Kamenev, to Trotsky, to learn or detect what Trotsky was preparing to do. Years afterward, in his autobiography, Trotsky tells of his significantly vital conversation with Kamenev:

"Kamenev was quite pale and agitated. The ground was slipping away under his feet." And Trotsky reveals how he restored Kamenev's equilibrium by telling him that he, Trotsky, opposed Lenin's request to remove Stalin from power. Here are Trotsky's fatal words: "I am against liquidating Stalin." (Leon Trotsky, *My Life*. II, 223-4, in Russian)

Why was Trotsky for retaining Stalin as General Secretary? Totally blind as to the exact direction the Stalin leadership would move with Lenin gone, calculating that a condition of collective supervision over the Party could and would be established, and weighing this perspective against a certainty of a dramatic struggle to break up the Stalin machine, Trotsky chose to ignore Lenin's advice and instruction to remove Stalin from the office of power. Had Lenin recovered, Trotsky, naturally, would have abided by his agreement to oust Stalin.

The Twelfth Party Congress met on April 17, 1923. It was a conspiratorial gathering against Lenin and for Stalin. All the top leaders of Bolshevism, with Trotsky as the central figure of the Congress decisively governing its proceedings, agreed to conceal Lenin's Testament from the outside world. Moreover, Lenin's letter opposing Stalin on the Georgian Question and a letter personally to Stalin in which Lenin broke off all relations with the General Secretary, were also suppressed. Hypocrisy ran high. Stalin, standing in the midst of delegates who knew of the Testament, some even mentioned Lenin's letter on Georgia, lied brazenly:

"I am sorry that Comrade Lenin is not present. If he were here, I think he would have said, 'For 25 years I was nursing the Party, and at last have nursed it to maturity.'" (*Pravda*, April 20, 1923). Stalin, as well as all other delegates and top leaders were well aware that Lenin could not be present to expose the entire hypocritical gathering. Stalin was not slow in recognizing that the danger of Trotsky's carrying out Lenin's instruction had passed, that Trotsky was now lined up with the thievish Stalin crew.

No different, in political or organizational sense, speeches and resolutions were presented at the Congress. Zinoviev, Stalin's second confederate in the ruling Stalin-Kamenev-Zinoviev Trio, announced enthusiastically: "All our resolutions have been adopted unanimously." (*Pravda*, April 26, 1923)

In sum, instead of the turmoil of the removal of Stalin from power and the breakup of his clique; instead of the choosing of a new General Secretary with the special provision of alertness against his attempts at manipulation of the appointments system to build a personal apparatus of power; a tranquil, almost festive atmosphere of complete Trotsky-Stalin unity prevailed at the Twelfth Party Congress. The gap between the lofty, powerful Trotsky, the head of the Red Army, and a much lesser figure, Stalin, who already, invisibly, stood above Trotsky in matters of state power, was successfully bridged by factually transferring Lenin's power to Stalin.

But beneath the warm surface of bureaucratic "unity" ambitions fed intrigue. A few months passed of apparent cordiality. Suddenly the Trio, manifesting a remarkable factional inventiveness and an aggressive solidarity, came out into the open field with a concocted story that Trotsky threatened to replace "Leninism" with "Trotskyism." The



story was supported with a barrage of documentation from the old disagreements between Trotsky and Lenin in the pre-revolutionary epoch. Upon the publication of this flimsy, factually unfounded charge, the Bolshevik Party, suddenly, found itself split in half. Trotsky's ancient remarks about the peasantry, and other, altogether forgotten points in theory, were now rigorously examined, and a new perspective for him was fabricated.

Trotsky largely was no naive boob. He clearly perceived that Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev treacherously double-crossed him, even as he himself treacherously had betrayed Lenin's trust, having promised, as he shows in his autobiography, to form a bloc with the sick head leader to fight for the removal of Stalin. Now, in burning bitterness he realized that he had committed a terrible blunder, a bureaucratic crime, at the Twelfth Party Congress. Had he then appealed to the delegates, in Lenin's name, for the removal of Stalin, the infamous General Secretary, together with his partners, would have come down and passed into oblivion. The new General Secretary, even if he were half as ambitious and brutal as Stalin would have to start building his personal power from scratch.

But after the hypocritical deceptive, distinctly anti-Lenin and pro-Stalin performance at the Twelfth Party Congress, with the loudly proclaimed unity behind the General Secretary, it was too late for Trotsky to turn back the wheel of history. Having misguided himself into participation with Stalin in concealing the Testament, in hiding from the eyes of the rank and file of the Party, from the lesser leaders as a whole, from the knowledge of the suppressed followers of Sapronov, of Kollontai, all anti-Stalin documents of Lenin, Trotsky established an invisible thread which bound him politically for the rest of his life to Stalin. In 1923, when large sections of the Party, beneath the seemingly calm surface, were still simmering with anti-bureaucratic fever, to make the whole filthy truth public meant to touch off a scandal of an appalling magnitude. With Lenin completely incapacitated, with many members of the Opposition still around, not only in prisons, or in the streets, but also in the Soviets, and even in the Party, the disclosure of the whole Stalin-Trotsky criminal mess would have given an impetus to the reconstruction and cleansing of the Bolshevik organization. In 1923 the Party was already swimming in rottenness and crime, but

still far from the degree of putrescence and criminality it would reach a few years later under Stalin. The rank and file of the Party, in its majority holding Lenin's name in great respect, even love, now enthralled by the General Secretary largely by means of deception, by his defense of "Leninism," would have demanded the arrest of the whole gamut of the conspirators of the Twelfth Party Congress—all of them, Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky in particular. They would have been brought before a revolutionary tribunal, would have been tried, and executed. The history of the Russian Revolution would have proceeded along the anti-bureaucratic course outlined by Lenin in 1917 before he swindled the power from the hands of the Second Congress of Soviets.

Not in a position to see that in the complexity of the whole affair Stalin's power would expand to lead eventually to the murder of nearly all the people around his seat of despotism, choosing to escape immediate death, Trotsky chose a relatively safe course. Fully realizing that he was fatally vulnerable, with no shield whatsoever, Trotsky in the face of rising attacks by the Trio remained *silent!* His friends expressed wonderment. Then, he, instead of even a distant intimation of an intrigue against him, gave a strange explanation of his seemingly fantastic behavior. He acted, or rather refrained from acting, he said, because the interests of the Party would be thus served! Here are his words: "I do not reply to some specific articles appearing recently in *Pravda* since I regard that this is more conforming with the interests of the Party." (Leon Trotsky, *Pravda*, Dec. 18, 1923)

This deceitful cloudiness was designed by Trotsky to cover up the fact that the Party, from the Politburo and the Central Committee down to the most distant unit in Siberia was in the hands of the Trio, as well as the State. The Party membership throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet Union discussed Trotsky's "explanation." Among the seven hundred thousand-odd supporters of Trotsky, not suspecting the hidden truth, the majority approved his tactic of silence.

Two months prior to the appearance of his "explanation," on October 15, 1923 a group of forty-six prominent Party members, some personal friends of Trotsky's, dispatched a letter to Stalin's Central Committee requesting the establishment of a harmonious collective leadership. In plain, the political line of the letter was a proposal to return to the fragile "Unity" of the Twelfth Party Congress. The letter said noth-



ing about the deceptive nature of the Trio's charges against Trotsky. "Radek sent a separate letter urging reconciliation with Trotsky inside the Political Bureau." (L. Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin, Explanatory Notes*, 314)

Thus, by unraveling the source and the course of that formidable despotism known as *Stalinism* through a penetrating study of the action and reaction of the major figures involved, from the very beginning of the stupendous tragedy, Lenin's gross and deliberate defrauding the Second Congress of Soviets on the night of the overthrow of Kerensky, his unprincipled fight to wipe out all internal opposition to his renegade policies, and finally his failure, due exclusively to Trotsky's treachery, to readjust the pattern of power, one can acquire an informative view of the deep complexities of the monstrous betrayal of the greatest revolution in human society.

\* \* \*

Trotsky had many close friends in Russia and in countries beyond its borders. One of them was an American Left-bourgeois writer, Max Eastman. When Eastman visited the Soviet Union he witnessed the unscrupulous attack against Trotsky. Delving somewhat into the Stalin-Trotsky mess, Eastman discovered that Lenin's last policy was to remove Stalin from power. He learned that several of Lenin's anti-Stalin documents were hidden by the Stalin clique, but copies of these papers were in the possession of the highest leaders of the Party. Eastman obtained from Trotsky a copy of the Testament. Meantime he was very puzzled by Trotsky's strangely passive behavior in the face of open and vociferous hounding and slander by the Stalin crew, obviously conducted for the nefarious purpose of pulling Trotsky down from his high pedestal and elevating Stalin.

Eastman went back home, and oppressed by the memory of the frame-up he had seen in Russia, he decided to act on his own and help Trotsky. He published the Testament and a book, *Since Lenin Died*, exposing, to the extent of his knowledge, the machinations for power by the Stalin group.

Eastman's revelation caused a great stir in the "Communist" organizations in the Capitalist world. Many a sincere member was aroused, feeling that if Eastman's story was true then, of course, an uncompromising fight to clean up the Soviet leadership by removing Stalin and his corrupt companions would have to be launched at once. The central question

was, what about the so-called Lenin's Testament? No one had ever heard of it before. Did Eastman invent it, or did it actually exist?

Stalin was alarmed. So was Trotsky. So was the entire gang of the lesser scoundrels. All had to take precautionary measures to forestall a crisis at home and abroad. And since Trotsky was the acknowledged leader of the "Opposition" to the Stalinists, he was the most logical person either to confirm or deny Eastman's exposure. Hence, on July 1, 1925, Trotsky issued a statement in which, among other things, he declared positively:

"Comrade Lenin has not left any 'will'; the character of his relations to the Party, and the character of the Party itself, exclude the possibility of such a 'will.' . . . All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie. . . ." (Leon Trotsky, *International Press Correspondence*, Sept. 3, 1925, 1005)

The leading circles of the "Communist" Parties in the Capitalist world used Trotsky's brazenly lying statement to demolish Eastman's exposure. A leader of the American section of the international "Communist" movement, Bertram D. Wolfe, gave a lecture on the subject. The theme was entitled "Since Eastman Lied."

Trotsky's barefaced lie was first published in Russia in the journal *Bolshevik*, producing a paralyzing effect upon his numerous followers.

Years later, in exile in Turkey, relying upon the well-known fact that most people have a very short memory, and almost all people forget important occurrences in history, Trotsky concealed his denial of the authenticity of the Testament. He made public a letter he had written to Muralov, a friend, in which he shamelessly wrote:

"Lenin's 'Testament' is no state or Party secret. It is no crime to publish it. On the contrary, it is a crime to keep it hidden from the Party and from the working class." (Leon Trotsky, *New International*, Nov. 1934, 125) In that admittedly criminal act, as his letter to Muralov shows, Trotsky had joined Stalin during the period of the Twelfth Party Congress in April 1923. Moreover, he participated with the Stalinists in making the Testament inaccessible to the workers for several years and even denied its authenticity!

Through 1925, Stalin completely relaxed his sinister hounding of the Trotskyites, and gave a new twist to his pursuit



of centralization of personal power by perfidiously turning upon his partners in the Trio, Zinoviev and Kamenev. Since Lenin's death, Stalin's authority, resting upon a network of ubiquitous regiments of appointed secretaries, local commissars, directors and Party officials rose immensely, while Zinoviev, in partial control of Leningrad, and Kamenev with no directing power whatsoever, merely drifted along behind the General Secretary. Like Trotsky, they were bound to Stalin by their participation in the conspiracy against Lenin.

The explosion occurred at the Fourteenth Party Congress, held December 18 to 31, 1925. With the Trotskyites standing silently aside, being fascinated by the incredible spectacle of the Trio falling apart, the supporters of Stalin and those of Zinoviev and Kamenev filled the atmosphere of the Congress with mutual recriminations, with charges of lying, of hypocrisy. Zinoviev revealed: "Every Leningrad Party worker will testify that for a whole year the Leningrad organization has been living in an atmosphere of gossip and in a condition a semi-siege. (Voices: "It's a lie; "It is true!)." (*Sten Report of the Fourteenth Party Congress*, Rus. 451)

Kamenev, a leader in Moscow, heaved a brick through Stalin's window when he declared: "We are against creating the theory of 'the leader' . . . I have arrived at the conclusion that Comrade Stalin is not capable of fulfilling the role of a unifier of the Bolshevik staff. (Voices from the seats: 'Not true!' 'Oh, so that's what it is!' 'You have shown your hand!' Noise. Applause of the Leningrad delegation. Shouts: 'We will not give you commanding heights!' 'We want Stalin!' 'We want Stalin!' Stormy applause)" (463)

The rampage ranged through most of the seats, demolishing and discrediting the Zinoviev-Kamenev delegations. With very few exceptions, the delegates who shouted "We want Stalin!" "We want Stalin!" were some years later murdered by Stalin.

Almost immediately following the Fourteenth Party Congress a wave of repression rolled over Leningrad. Sometime later most of the men whom Stalin sent to bring Leningrad into his fold were arrested and executed.

Dishonored, their local power evaporated, growing daily more and more desperate in their humiliating and ominous defeat, Zinoviev and Kamenev made a sharp and wholly unexpected political turn. They approached Trotsky with a proposal of unity. Only yesterday, so to speak, they had labored

to pull him down through the concocted accusation of "Trotskyism." Meanwhile, Trotsky faced hundreds of thousands of followers, Party members vastly demoralized by his "Oppositional" inactivity, by his support to Stalin during the critical days of Eastman's exposure. They were aching for an all-out fight against the arbitrary power of the General Secretary. Just two years earlier, in the fall of 1923, they had seen better days when the Party was equally divided between Trotsky and Stalin, and in certain centers the supporters of Trotsky were in the majority. So now, considerably deflated, following a sparse, extremely passive political line, the Trotskyite ranks, particularly their youth wing, saw in the projected unity with the Zinovievites a touch of a fresh breeze.

After some negotiations, in 1926, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev formed an Opposition Bloc, which soon included a few remnants of the old oppositional tendencies. The ranks cheered up, expecting action, but its leaders, umbilically attached to Stalin, remained wretchedly passive. The depths of misery to which they sank is revealed in their humble cringing and squirming before the powerful General Secretary. But the pressure from the ranks for initiating a struggle was increasing from day to day.

At length, on October 1, 1926, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev put their fortunes to a test by addressing a Party unit at the Aviopribor Plant in Moscow. This was the first semblance of action against Stalin, rather an indication of criticism. The chief point of the Opposition leaders was very modest—they asked for opening a discussion in the Party within limits set by economics and by the Stalin gang.

The following few days the Stalin-controlled press conducted a violent denunciation of the Opposition Bloc. The general cry of his bureaucratic ventriloquists was "The Party wants Socialist work, not empty babbling!" After this "elucidation," unit upon unit of the Party voted to condemn the Opposition.

The Opposition Bloc was in a burst of psychological collapse. Two weeks after appearing at the Aviopribor Plant, on October 16, 1926 its leaders published a pathetic declaration of submission to Stalin, a pledge to discontinue all oppositional activity. *The New York Times* printed the report from its Moscow correspondent, Walter Duranty, regarding Trotsky's miserable surrender, and alongside an article by Max Eastman which contained Lenin's Testament. A big head-



line in the newspaper (Oct. 18, 1926) said: "Trotsky Admits Defeat. Bows to Stalin Group as the Real Red Chiefs."

Several days later Walter Duranty again cabled from Moscow: "It is interesting to speculate on what has been the effect of the recent publication by *The New York Times* of the Lenin Testament articles. There has been no press comment whatsoever and both sides in the struggle are characteristically reticent."

The leaders of the "Communist" Party in the United States in private conversations with members cited Trotsky's denial of the authenticity of the Testament. In Russia Trotsky was silent—not only for his own sake but also for the sake of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

The year that followed was a year of torture for the Opposition. Particularly the Trotskyites were persecuted. Many of them were expelled from the Party on invented charges. A few were under arrest. Rumors were spreading that Stalin was preparing to expel the entire Opposition Bloc. At last, at the October 1927 plenum of the Central Committee the exasperated to the extreme leaders of the Opposition Bloc were no longer reticent regarding the Testament. Trotsky ventured to remark about Lenin's advice to the Twelfth Congress to remove Stalin: "The Party did not know this council in time. A selected officialdom concealed his letter." (cited in the Trotskyite platform, *The Real Situation in Russia*, 8) In his mind Trotsky locked the memory about his private assurance to Stalin's then-partner in the Trio, Kamenev, "I am against liquidating Stalin," as he relates in *My Life*, and the stand he took in April 1923 at the "unity" Party Congress where he joined Stalin in the suppression of Lenin's Testament.

In reply to Trotsky's remark about "a selected officialdom" Stalin admitted the authenticity of the Testament, as cited in this document, read it for general publication in *Pravda* and in the literature of the "Communist" parties abroad; and with an overpowerful pose of exposing Trotsky as an outrageous liar, cheat, and unprincipled political charlatan, Stalin read Trotsky's statement on Eastman's publication of the Testament that all talk about Lenin's Testament was "a despicable lie." And then, suddenly, Stalin told an incredible story, which was a part of his speech. He revealed to the whole world and for the first time to the ranks of the Party and of the Opposition Bloc that he had actually presented his

resignation to his own and to the "Opposition" factions. And what happened? At this point, when the seeming goal of the Trotskyites and Zinovievites to remove Stalin apparently reached the stage of achievement, the leaders of the "Opposition" drew back. Here are Stalin's own words to that effect: "All the delegations, including Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev, unanimously resolved that Stalin should remain in his post. What could I do? Run away from the post? It is not in my character to do that. I have never run away from any post, no matter what post it was, and I have no right to do so, because that would be desertion." Stalin, *Pravda*, Nov. 2, 1927)

Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev heard what Stalin said—to the utter disbelief of most of the members of the Party. Was Stalin lying? They did not say. As a matter of record, they made no reply to this revelation. The shabby heads of the "Opposition," on the surface dedicated to the cause of the toiling masses, to Socialism, professing to adhere to Lenin's policy to remove Stalin, got tangled in their highflown lies and self-suffocating hypocrisy. Cramped within their craniums was the only true explanation of their "strange" behavior, as well as of Stalin's, that after the Twelfth Party Congress Stalin could not be removed through political fiat without a shattering, macabre disclosure of their signal contribution to the retaining him in power. Lenin's Testament was now a rock upon which Stalin leaned for support, for he had submitted his resignation, in accord with Lenin's line, but the Party, especially Trotsky, voted to keep Stalin in power. In an environment of iron bureaucratic dictatorship which in severity and blood-letting approached the French Revolution, had the whole dirty story around the Testament been revealed, the principals of the Twelfth Party Congress—it must be emphasized again and again—would have been punished by the originally uninvolved bureaucrats not otherwise than by arrest, trial, and execution by a firing squad, the "guillotine" of the Bolshevik Revolution. The great masters of conspiracy, in harmony or in disunity, understood this very well. So Stalin cheerfully presented his resignation, and Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev ruefully rejected it.

Several decades hence, in a Trotskyite compilation titled *Samizdat: Voices of the Soviet Opposition*, printed in New York in 1974, in the main article of the collection, "Memoirs of a Bolshevik Leninist," one reads in reference to Stalin's resignation: "It seemed that Lenin's Testament and his ad-



vice about assigning Stalin to other work, removing him from the apparatus of the Central Committee, had been forgotten. And suddenly . . . Stalin himself proposed that he be re-assigned from the position of general secretary. 'We were thrown into confusion,' Kamenev told us later. 'We were not ready for this. The voluntary offer to step down from the position of general secretary disarmed us. There was no alternative candidate at hand. We told Stalin, 'there's no need to rush; this is no joking matter; we have to find a candidate for this post, and then we can straighten this all out. . . .''

The circumlocutory deceit in Kamenev's excuse for the rejection by Trotsky and his allies of Stalin's offer to resign was obvious to every participant in the suppression of the Testament at the Twelfth Party Congress.

Prior to the October 1927 Plenum of the Central Committee the heads of the "Opposition" submitted to the Stalin leadership of the Party an extensive document known as the *Platform of the Opposition*, published later by the American Trotskyites under the title *The Real Situation in Russia*. The central programmatic position in the document is *unity with the Stalin faction!*

"Stalin propagates his own program—to 'cut off' the opposition—under the false flag of a pretense that the Opposition wants to create a 'second' party. The Opposition answers with its slogan: "Unity of the Russian Communist Party at all costs.'" (125) This slogan implied the return to the position assumed by all the leaders at the Twelfth Party Congress, to cover up all the crimes committed since then by both sides.

The next outstanding anti-Opposition Bloc act in the vast internal drama in the Soviet Union was played out at the Fifteenth Party Congress, dubbed by the Trotskyites the Expulsion Congress, held December 2-19, 1927. The Congress was opened by Stalin's "favorite," Rykov. Years later Stalin "rewarded" the vast majority of the 1,669 delegates for his line to expell the Opposition Bloc by having them, including Rykov, imprisoned, tortured and murdered.

Stalin at the Congress laid down his absolute condition: "the Opposition must disarm entirely and completely both in ideological and in organizational respects." (*Sten. Rep. R.* 82)

In contrast to Stalin's October 1926 position which allowed the "Opposition" a solace of professing to maintain an organizational form and of pretending to hold crumbs of indepen-

dent thinking in the sphere of economy or on the question of revolution in China, his demand now was that the "Opposition" must accept his dictatorship unreservedly. It was to be understood that to hold an opinion on any subject different from that of "the Party" would be punished not merely by expulsion from "the Party" but by arrest and exile to the isolators in the desolate northern regions, or to Siberia, factually a death sentence.

Without presenting to the "Oppositionists" a chance to discuss Stalin's conditions, the Congress voted to expel the entire Opposition Bloc. Arrest and deportations began almost immediately upon the expulsion.

Hurriedly, Zinoviev and Kamenev prostrated before Stalin and begged to be readmitted into the Party, accepting all his terms. They were taken back as rank and filers, and henceforth were held in utter contempt by the Stalinists. But Trotsky understood that his case was altogether different from theirs. He had been a colossal figure in the Revolution. He was Stalin's main target. Were he to follow supinely their example he, having stood high above Stalin, and this was known to all contemporary Bolshevik leaders, would have been reduced to a position below Stalin's meanest flunkey, spat upon and besmirched not only by the Stalinists, not only by the Zinovievites, but also by a large portion of the working class, by the veterans of the Civil War, and held in contempt by his closest friends. Mercilessly hounded, he would have been merely waiting for his physical end. On the other hand, there was quite a different, a respectable alternative. He could reassume his old theoretical pose of arguing against Stalin that Socialism in one country was impossible. He could criticise Stalin's economic policy; he could unfold a censorious evaluation of Stalin's policies in the "Communist" parties abroad; and finally, he could be presenting to the Stalin bandits of power the utopian demand for his reinstatement into the Party on the basis of collective leadership. His chief pretense would be that he was guiding the international working class toward world revolution.

Trotsky chose this course. Most of his followers stoically stood by him. They were arrested by tens of thousands. And on January 16, 1928, a little less than a month after expulsion, Trotsky himself was exiled to Alma Ata, Kazak Republic of the Soviet Union, in Central Asia. There he at once unfolded his abstract, purely theoretical "Oppositional" activity.



Soviet society in the first year of the wholesale arrests of the Trotskyites was a boiling cauldron. Strikes broke out, the workers demanding the return of Trotsky. The secret Menshevik correspondent in Moscow wrote to his paper in Berlin that such a demand, indeed, was presented to the Stalin apparatus by the striking workers of the Luberets plant: "What is most interesting, among the demands there appeared something new, political: to rescind the order for Trotsky's exile." (*Sotsialistichesky Vestnik*, Feb. 21, 1928)

About a year of Trotsky's exile in Alma Ata produced no real social rest in the Soviet Union. To calm the political waters, conscious of the fact that politically Trotsky was chained to the criminal nature of Stalin pronounced at the Twelfth Party Congress, Stalin deported him to Turkey. This was done, naturally, by agreement with the Turkish authorities. Trotsky landed there on February 12, 1929.

\* \* \*

Abroad were many "Communist" groups and parties originating after the Bolshevik seizure of power in Russia from the Left splitoffs of the Socialist, or Second International and from some independent Anarchist organizations. Under Lenin's guidance, on March 2, 1919, they were formed into the "Communist" or Third International. Their well-informed leaders, some remarkable virtuosos in the field of research, either ignored or consciously suppressed all information regarding the anti-Lenin inner-Party oppositional struggles in Russia, and all the leaders mesmerized their followers into unquestioning support to the Lenin regime. Its first chairman was Zinoviev, a collaborator with Lenin until 1922 when he continued in this office as a partner of Stalin. He was removed officially in October 1926 by Stalin's order.

From the very origin of the "Communist" International, its component parties were split up into factions, the leaders of each group fighting to install themselves in control of their particular component of the "Communist" International, or to retain the helm when in power. Zinoviev's position as the chairman was never questioned. That was left entirely to the Russian leadership.

A few of the factions, duplicating the situation in the Soviet "Communist" Party, raised the Trotsky flag for prestige. A great name counts in the world of ignorance. The Trotskyites in various parties were classified as oppositionists to those in power, and in consequence of the expulsion of the

Opposition Bloc in Russia, the foreign Trotskyites were also expelled from the "Communist" Parties.

Trotsky, now residing in Turkey, was working on his autobiography. It was a different Trotsky from the one who on May 17, 1917, came to Petrograd from across the Atlantic. That Trotsky went through a complete metamorphosis, beginning with the deviation from rectitude in principles and conduct when he delivered his deceptive speech to the Second Congress of Soviets on the night of the overthrow of the Kerensky Government. Since then he, morally completely decayed, his path paved with a thousand monstrous lies to the workers, with the betrayal of hundreds of thousands of his trustful followers to Stalin's hangmen.

The leaders of the expelled Trotskyist groups got in contact with Trotsky. He linked these groups into an international "Left Opposition" of the Stalin-directed "Communist" International, calling them, for greater deception, "Bolshevik-Leninists."

Most of the founders of the Trotskyist groups were seasoned bureaucrats well familiar with the pro-Stalin character of Trotsky's post-Lenin story. Not too far back they had all participated in popularizing Trotsky's lie against Eastman's exposure of Stalin's power conspiracy. Since then they had learned from Stalin's speech that the Testament was authentic, but pretended to forget Trotsky's disavowal of the document. They were political cheats and thorough scoundrels, as were those who expelled them from the "Communist" parties, in America Lovestone, Browder, Foster, Gitlow and Wolfe. They told their followers fictitious stories about themselves having been developing inside the "Communist" Party on the anti-Stalin line and adopting Trotsky's stand of "fighting" Stalinism. Thus, James P. Cannon, the founder of the American Trotskyist group, lied about his faction's past in the "Communist" Party as follows: "The protracted period of our gestation as a faction *on the line* of the Bolsheviks-Leninists has not been without compensating advantages." (*Militant*, May 10, 1930)

For two years this story of gestation stood as authentic. Then, in June 1932 his co-leaders of the American Trotskyist group, Shachtman, Aberg and Glotzer, forming a faction to fight Cannon's bureaucratic leadership, issued an internal document, "The Situation in the American Opposition: Prospect and Retrospect." Here is what it said about Can-



non's "gestation" story: "Theoretically, this contention does not rest upon a shred of real evidence. The old Cannon group in the Party was not 'developing logically'; was not 'gestating' toward the Left Opposition . . . the Cannon group stood upon the platform of international Stalinism. . . ." (13)

However, while Trotsky's supine policy of objective political collaboration with Stalin and the prostitution of his intellect were well known to the international Cannons and Shachtmans, none of them showed any sign of knowledge of the original usurpation of power by the Bolshevik leader on the night of the overthrow of the Provisional Government.

If when Trotsky was in Russia he led his followers toward destruction by Stalin's hangmen, then when he was abroad, he guided his followers into the bloody hands of Hitler and Franco, and finally paid with his own life. He was assassinated by a Stalinist agent on August 20, 1940. His movement in the United States, called the Socialist Workers Party, became the largest of his international sections. Its basic line is a critical support to Moscow, and in order to capture the left-moving workers and students, it sustains itself as an heir of 1917 pre-power Bolshevism, and completely disembodies the real Trotsky of the Stalinist and of the post-power Leninist eras. To its own deceptive voice has been added the false chorus of near-Trotskyites. Here is a sample:

"As a sign of special confidence in Trotsky, Lenin as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars gave him a *carte blanche* in 1918. . . . In 1927 Trotsky submitted Lenin's *carte blanche*, unused, to the party archives. No, Trotsky had never used this against his enemies. His moral purity was always of the highest order." (*Samizdat*, 125-6)

\* \* \*

The "Communists" in the Capitalist countries have been a strong and valuable prop to Moscow's policies. Their approval of the Stalin regime was systematically played up by his flunkies in Russia. Their behavior code with regard to Capitalism was to stand back in a crisis in the most advanced countries from achieving the removal of the Capitalist class lest such revolution would unleash a high-pitched democratic workers' upheaval, much more powerful than the anti-Lenin rebellions in the Bolshevik Party. Such upheaval, naturally, would arouse anti-bureaucratic repercussions in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, Moscow could tolerate a "Com-

munist" seizure of power by a bureaucratic-led army in very backward, peasant countries, such as China, or Cuba or Vietnam and Cambodia. However even such seizure of power did not preclude the danger to Moscow of "Titoism," or "Maoism," a sharp break from the Soviet Union, as it occurred during Stalin's life in Yugoslavia, or after his death in China.

For a long time the Capitalist governments the world over, not clear about the true political line of the "Communists," as well as of the Kremlin's "antagonistic" supporters, the Trotskyites, frequently persecuted these political tendencies, outlawed their organizations, imprisoned their leaders, without any substantially valid reasons. But in time the Capitalist politicians learned something in life regarding these pro-Russian movements. One of the greatest lessons was the "Communist" disruption of the occupation of the entire French industry by ten million workers in May 1968. A *New York Times* dispatch said: "Even the Gaullist *Paris Presse* has reported that Government leaders during the crisis have blessed the Communist Party every day." (*N.Y.T.* May 31, 1968)

The pivot of the "Communist" world is the former Tsarist Empire. There the "Communist" leaders, for the first time in history, removed from their national framework an important social element, the Capitalist class, substituting for it a well-organized, ever-growing, privileged bureaucracy. While the fact of the overthrow of the Capitalists by the Russian masses has become a revered tradition to the radical workers throughout the Capitalist world, it constitutes the basic source of mutual irritation and, periodically, of intense hatred between the Soviet bureaucracy and world Capitalism. Hence, the chief problem the leading cadres of Capitalism face since the overthrow of the Capitalist government in Russia is to reconstitute the Russian society upon the Capitalist basis of private ownership of industry. The Bolshevik usurpers, on the other hand, while guarded by the inner sense of danger from the international Capitalist shadow hanging over their heads, are propelled by the motivation to expand and extend their power and privileges far beyond their present geographical limits over the turbulent waters of all the seas and over the cities and farms of all the distant from Moscow lands.

\* \* \*

Following Stalin's death (March 5, 1953) the chief of po-



litical police, Beria, and his closest lieutenants plotted to seize the control of the State. But Khrushchev and his faction, which included the present dictator, Brezhnev, got wind of the conspiracy and in a lightning-speed counterplot arrested and, without a public trial, or even a semblance of a trial, executed the entire Beria clique. Had Beria succeeded, his regime would have been enveloped with respectability in Russia and in the Capitalist countries, while Khrushchev, Brezhnev and the rest of their company would have finished their dream of power by facing a firing squad, the active "guillotine" of the Russian Revolution.

The boisterous part-demagogue, part-clown, Nikita Khrushchev, had been a first-class hatchetman under Stalin, carrying out numerous executions in the Ukraine. After Stalin's death, for many years, he was in the saddle of power, without a cloud darkening his merry career. Suddenly, one morning the world gaped in amazement upon learning that Khrushchev had "resigned" all his high posts, and that one of his subordinates, Leonid Brezhnev, had assumed the pilotship of the Soviet State. The new head took control neither through the bureaucratic channels nor by presenting his candidature to the Party. Far from being elected to the post of commander in chief of all the economic, political and military forces of the State, he seized it by stealth at night in a narrow-range conspiracy of a few individuals of the Khrushchev circle. Without a visible turmoil the plot was quietly conceived and executed, to the utter astonishment but silent submission of the people of the U.S.S.R. It was an unexpected thunderclap to Khrushchev who awakened in the morning to discover that his seemingly unchallenged and uniquely personal influence was in the gutter and that he was a victim of the true and only political disaster in his life wrought by his bosom friend, Brezhnev.

The respectable official Capitalist world accepted Brezhnev without much comment or critical fuss as the legitimate head of the Soviet Union. In that the Capitalist leaders adhered to the old pattern of recognizing and dealing with the worst power-bandits in history, Stalin, Hitler, Franco, and every other criminal and murderer in power.

Brezhnev put a halt to the process of de-Stalinization introduced by Khrushchev, and little by little reversed the trend. Step by step he reintroduced certain aspects of Stalinist oppression, greatly expanded the policy of enlarging the

Moscow might, and, most important, achieved nuclear parity with the United States.

\* \* \*

Some guiding remarks are in place here regarding Brezhnev's involvement in the Arab-Israeli conflicts, because of the complexity of the political nature of Israel being a Zionist State, and at the same time, nationally, a Jewish State, evoking the issue of anti-Semitism. The supplying of arms to the Arab semi-Feudal States, to shieks, to some actual chattel slaveholders, has been carried on by Brezhnev under the deceptive disguise of advancing the "Arab revolution" against the American imperialist pawn, Zionist Israel. But there is in life a separation between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. The Tsar's regime was overtly and viciously anti-Semitic but was friendly to Zionism. Witness the cordial reception given by the Tsarist officials to Dr. Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism. Stalin was surreptitiously anti-Semitic, and for a while was also anti-Zionist. But after defeating the Nazis, though remaining inwardly anti-Semitic, he introduced in his foreign policy an active support to Zionism, as his *Bolshaia Sovietskaya Encyclopedia* records:

"During the discussion of the Palestine Question in the Security Council of the United Nations, the Delegation of the Soviet Union proposed to liquidate the British Mandate over Palestine and create in Palestine a bi-national Arab-Jewish State; but if this will not be possible (in view of the artificial sharpening by the imperialists of antagonism between the Arabs and the Jews) to divide Palestine into two independent States, Arab and Jewish. The latter proposal was accepted by the General Assembly of the U.N." (XVII, 515)

The promoters of Zionism expressed gratitude to the big powers. Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, speaking for the Jewish Agency, among other things stated the following: "The Jewish people will be forever grateful to the nations which contributed to the decision. We are especially appreciative of the leadership provided by the United States and the Soviet Union." (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, XII, 243-4)

At that time, Stalin was preoccupied with the task of rebuilding Russia after the most devastating invasion in world history and in absorbing countries in Eastern Europe his troops occupied after defeating the Nazis. He was not thinking of conducting a power game against the United States in



the Middle East. Significantly, during the 1947-48 Israeli-Arab war Stalin even sent to Israel "an arms shipment from Czechoslovakia aboard the freighter S. S. Atalene." (David Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, 92)

But Stalin's action in the United Nations was in a sense both anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist. The Jews are a special, a unique social element. In the Greek and Roman antiquity they were established as a political scapegoat. After the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Emperor Constantine, the Jews were persecuted, tortured and murdered by the dignitaries of the Church, by the Christian princes and kings, butchered by Mahomet, robbed and killed by the Crusaders. Capitalism took over Christianity, trimmed it of its Feudal trappings, but in the *New Testament* the ancient accusation of the Jews as the betrayers of the mythical "Son of God" to the Roman executioners remained. In "Guidelines" appearing in *The New York Times* of January 3, 1975 the Vatican declared: "Obviously, one cannot alter the text of the Bible." The fourth evangel in the *New Testament*, that of St. John, lays openly the charge against all the Jews. By virtue of the fact that Christianity is the only religion based on condemning a whole nationality, Christian anti-Semitism is deeply rooted in the Western world.

But side by side with Christian anti-Semitism there are "simple," social accusations against the Jews. Such forms of anti-Semitism were dormant in the Moslem Arab countries prior to the formation of Israel. They spread like wildfire after that State was founded.

So when Stalin ordered his representatives in the United Nations to arrange for the creation of a little Jewish Capitalist State, he, as well as the leaders of the Christian nations, could not have failed to grasp the profound fact that they were placing that tiny State into a hornet's nest of large and small Arab powers whose rulers would not rest until they wiped it out of existence.

In the Brezhnev period the Soviet Union became deeply involved in the Middle East. It contributed to the Arab chiefs literally billions of dollars worth of arms and other war equipment in their conflicts with Israel. To meet the charges of anti-Semitism and of oppression of millions of Soviet Jews, the "Communist" bureaucrats explained that their policy was merely anti-Zionist, never anti-Jewish. Research overpowers this explanation by showing that the poison of anti-

Semitism made its appearance in Bolshevik Russia long before the formation of Israel, when Zionism took hold of both the Jewish workers and the Jewish Capitalists, even before the advent of Stalin to power. A full index of anti-Semitic events and literature in the Soviet Union is out of place here, but a few almost incredible illustrations will suffice. Thus, one of Brezhnev's men, Yury V. Bondarev, wrote a critique of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, saying, among other things:

"I cannot overlook certain generalizations Solzhenitsyn makes on various pages in regard to the Russian people. . . . Whence this anti-Slavonic sentiment?" And Bondarev, to appear to probe more deeply into Solzhenitsyn's supposed anti-Slavism, brought up the image of Dostoevsky as an ideal friend of all nationalities: "The great titan Dostoevsky, passed through not seven but all nine rounds of life's hell. He saw the petty and the great, experienced more than a man can possible experience (the expectation of execution, exile, convict labor, decline of personality). But in no work of his stooped to national nihilism. On the contrary, he loved man and rejected in him what was bad and asserted what was good, just as most of the great writers of world literature, when studying the character of their nation." (*New York Times*, Jan. 27, 1974)

Let the reader look up Dostoevsky's *Diary of a Writer*. In it is a blasting refutation of Bondarev. Referring to Tsar Alexander II as the liberator of the peasantry from serfdom, Dostoevsky drew a picture of the enslavement of the Russian peasantry by the Jews. In the course of whipping up the mind of the reader against the Jews, Dostoevsky virtually called for the extermination of the Jews in Russia: "But if there were in Russia three million Russians, not Jews, and eighty million Jews,—well, what would they have done to Russians. . . . Would they have allowed equal rights? Would they have permitted them freedom of worship? Would they not have transformed them at once into slaves? Would they not have done worse than that and torn their skin off altogether? Would they not beat them to a pulp, to final extermination, as they had done with stronger peoples in the distant past, in their Ancient history?"

In this vein Dostoevsky prophesied that in the future of Russia "The Jews will drink the people's blood." He thus intimated that the one way to chose the forestallment of the supposed future role of vampire bats the Jews should be



eliminated from the Tsar's empire. In plain, Dostoevsky suggested to the Tsarist authorities the policy of expulsion of the Jews carried out by the Spanish Inquisition.

Maxim Gorky despised Dostoevsky, not for his anti-Semitism, to be sure, but for his work *Demons*. Lenin some years before the fall of the Tsar called the author of *Demons* "the abominable Dostoevsky." But soon after the formation of the Bolshevik Government, Lenin republished the works of Dostoevsky, the *Demons* and the *Diary* included, without a single word of criticism. On November 11, 1921, an imposing exhibition was held in Moscow commemorating the hundredth anniversary of Dostoevsky's birth. Lenin's Commissar of Education, Lunacharsky, lionized that abominable writer: "perhaps the most fascinating and beautiful is the figure of Dostoevsky." (*Krasnaia Nov*, Nov.-Dec. 1921, 211)

Solzhenitsyn grew up in an atmosphere of post-1917 Leninism-Stalinism, and probably that was why he did not search for the illumination of the true character of Dostoevsky. In that sordid Anti-Semite and pulverizer of a realistic approach to the appraisal of the Tsarist aristocracy, Solzhenitsyn sees a profound thinker: "Dostoevsky was the right kind of author for prisoners to read!" (*Gulag*, 214) "I still have not forgotten what Dostoevsky had to say in his *Diary of a Writer* against our trial by jury." (287) "But spiritually Dostoevsky far outstripped the realities of our life. . . ." (288)

Dostoevsky through his *Diary of a Writer* produced hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of either outspoken or reticent anti-Semites. Solzhenitsyn overlooked this significant fact. Who should be blamed for that? Solzhenitsyn? No, Lenin, who, after he usurped power, vigorously reversed himself on many vital questions, ordered to reprint the classics of the Tsarist era, including the vicious anti-Semite Dostoevsky, without a single word of antidote warning to the reader to beware of their reactionary, often anti-Semitic seasoning.

This literary anti-Semitism, which whispered evil ideas into the psychology of the intelligentsia of Tsarist society, continues today doing so in the Soviet society. Under the Tsar it suggested daily verbal assaults, and sometimes physical attacks, upon the Jews, and it performs identical functions under the "Communist" regime. For example, a correspondent of *The New York Times*, Hedrick Smith, re-

ported an incident involving Arkady Raikin, the leading comic of the Soviet Union:

"A few years back, during a show in the Ukrainian capital of Kiev, someone in the audience shouted 'kike' at Mr. Raikin, who is Jewish, and he demanded: 'Who said that?' A deadly stillness settled over the audience. 'Whoever said that—put up you hand,' he insisted. No one did, and Mr. Raikin walked off the stage. That ended the show." (Feb. 4, 1974)

This was an expression of common, street anti-Semitism. Dostoevsky represented *literary* anti-Semitism. The Lenin regime republished other Tsarist anti-Semitic writers, also without an appropriate warning to the reader to beware of their crude anti-Semitism, such as Pushkin's, or humorous anti-Semitism, as is Gogol's. Literary anti-Semitism is a world phenomenon, directly observable. At the head of this branch of anti-Semitism stands Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* portraying a Jew loan-shark, bloodthirsty and vindictive, attempting to cut a pound of living flesh from the body of an honest, Christian merchant. It has been translated into every important language and is shown all over the globe. In Bolshevik Russia, almost immediately upon the launching of "the Soviet of People's Commissars" the play was presented in Moscow. "Chronologically the first Shakespearean play in Moscow was the *Merchant of Venice* shown in 1917 and in the beginning of 1918 in the Maly Theatre." (*Literaturnaia Gazeta*, Dec. 4, 1935, 4)

The reprinting of the anti-Semitic classics of the Tsarist era, the showing of the *Merchant of Venice*, for educational purposes, in themselves, were no offense. But done without an appropriate introduction, a warning against the anti-Semitic poison these works contain, without even a footnote of explanation of the negative aspects in these reactionary literary products, was a crime. It is an accurate measuring device to expose the anti-Jewish molding of the impressionable mind of Russian youth, and a psychological direction to the mind of adults.

But the Bolshevik authorities do something which is even worse than the spreading of *literary* anti-Semitism through a mechanical reproduction of the classics. They praise those authors in the highest terms, as they do with Dostoevsky, and thus package off the hidden poison wrapped in attractively written stories, even of the most magnificent beauty (Pushkin). Against common, street anti-Semitism there are



laws in the Soviet Union, but *literary* anti-Semitism receives acclaim, flattery, clapping of hands. Hence, the Russian, Polish, Ukrainian peoples in the Soviet Union mentally are impelled to shout "kike" at every Jewish member of the community. And sometimes a prejudicial remark thrusts itself forth out of the mouth of a passerby in the street. Driving the anti-Jewish spirit inward, the surrounding crowd usually does not want to get directly involved. Thus, there was no stir of protest in Raikin's audience to the reported anti-Semitic outcry. It is obvious, however, that everyone in the theatre gave the shouter a tacit support. The response of the Soviet authorities and of the "Communist" writers abroad to the charge of anti-Semitism in Bolshevik Russia that this social virus was eliminated together with Tsarism is palpably a fraud.

\* \* \*

It is necessary to place into the field of mental vision a perception of the windings and turnings embracing the Soviet Union and the United States, to attempt to illuminate the dilemma Russian "Communism" represents to the Capitalist world, and the intricacy of facing American Capitalism by the Soviet bureaucracy.

What is the special web which magnetically has entangled the Bolshevik State and the United States since President Wilson sent American troops into Russia with the aim of re-establishing Capitalism in that country? What specific patterns of life, or death, will the two powers and the rest of humanity face in the next several years? What grim, partly obscured evidence points to an extreme contingency to be expected?

The American military intervention in Russia under General Graves marked an extremely hostile period of the United States' attitude toward the Kremlin. Following the withdrawal of the American troops the relations between the two governments were cool, even unfriendly, especially on the part of Washington, which stubbornly refused to extend diplomatic recognition to the Lenin and then to the Stalin regime. But after the advent of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the presidency the waspish atmosphere began to dissolve. On November 17, 1933, the United States took the plunge and recognized the Soviet Union. "Friendly" relations ensued until the Stalin-Hitler partition of Poland, turning overtly unfriendly during Stalin's military attack on Finland

in 1940. The unfriendliness was sharply dropped when Russia was invaded by the Nazi army after America's entry into the military picture. Washington became an "ally" of Moscow.

When the Nazi forces in Russia were being pushed considerably back, Roosevelt and Churchill consorted with Stalin at Yalta like old bosom chums, and turned over to the "Communist" dictator almost half of Europe as a "gift."

But less than a year after the collapse of the Nazi military machine, on March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill depicted Stalin as a new aggressor. On that date, in a speech at Fulton, Missouri, he declared: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an Iron Curtain has descended across the Continent." The "Iron Curtain" speech gave an impetus to the slowly developing "Cold War" between Capitalist powers and "Communist" Russia, leading, one could assume, towards its logical culmination, the hot war, for the release from Stalin's grip all the East European countries. Suddenly, when the "Cold War" was reaching a high pitch, President Truman announced that, from the information he received, Stalin was in possession of the atomic bomb!

The astonishing news put a new angle on tomorrow's history. If there was a Roosevelt-Churchill plan to show up Stalin as an aggressor like Hitler by actually aiding "Communist" Russia in the establishment of an "Iron Curtain" across Europe, that plan went awry. Now, a war with Russia would be an *atomic* war! The vicious "Cold War" was reaching a nervous stage. The ominous vision of Hiroshima descended upon New York and other American cities. Bomb shelters were built in the subways, in libraries, in private houses. At length, over the months and years, the savage turmoil of the "Cold War" began to subside. A new era was dawning. There loomed the fearful armament race between the Capitalist-democratic United States and "Communist" Russia. Two or three years after the initiation of the race, the intricate pattern of relations between the two powers took on an entirely new turn.

Declaring a complete and irreversible abandonment of the strategy of the "Cold War" and its accompanying passions, gradually discarding the vituperations against each other, the chiefs of American imperialism and the top bureaucrats of the Soviet Union opened an era of economic, cultural and social cooperation, naming their action *detente*. For a time



a new vision was projected to the world. A claim was voiced to develop collaboration between Capitalist United States and "Communist" U.S.S.R. in the efforts to explore outer space, to link up the American with the Russian spacecraft, to share scientific information in medicine and other sciences, to expand cultural exchanges, to lay down a foundation for increasing trade between the two countries. An accord has been announced on cooperative forestry research as to methods to control forest fires and forest insects and diseases. A link has been established between botanical centers in the United States and the Soviet Union, to work together to save many threatened species of wild and cultivated plants.

Both parties in the beginning of detente presented to the skeptics and unbelievers in miracles a mild face of enlightened Liberalism. In America the proper noun "Russia," only recently invoking tart-worded response, has begun to appear in a soft light. The use of Churchill's phrase "Iron Curtain" has been dropped. The Kremlin leaders, on the other side, for a while pretended a concession on emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. Taking notice of the world protest of Capitalist intellectuals, the Brezhnev power circle exiled Solzhenitsyn abroad instead of executing, or at least, imprisoning him. Brezhnev allowed the dancers, Panovs, to leave Russia. A reversal was made by the Soviet rulers in an almost forgotten case, as a dispatch from Moscow reported: "A Brooklyn-born woman in Lithuania who has been seeking to return to the United States for 30 years has informed the American Embassy here that the Soviet authorities have at last granted her an exit visa." (N.Y.T., Nov. 2, 1974)

The sailor, Kudirka, who on November 13, 1970 leaped from a Soviet fishing boat onto an American Coast Guard cutter but was immediately returned to the master of the Soviet fishing boat, beaten into unconsciousness, brought back to the U.S.S.R., charged with treason and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, was released six years before the expiration of his term. He was allowed to leave for the United States. His ordeal included repeated arrests of his mother, and "the eviction of his wife and family from their home." (N.Y.T., Nov. 6, 1974)

On the whole, these few gestures of humaneness foreshadowed a very promising future for detente. Particularly gratifying to both superpowers was the fact that the difference in the histories and forms of their mutually exclusive social, political

and economic systems was played down almost to a point of forgiveness and virtual amnesia.

At the same time the two superpowers instituted, through their professional experts in the technique of Capitalist-"Communist" negotiations, the Strategic Armaments Limitation Talks, the SALT, with the underlying express purpose to explore the means for reducing the armament race.

\* \* \*

The zigzags in the history of relations between the Capitalist United States and "Communist" Russia are reminiscent, to a large extent, of the twists and turns in the relations between the Nazis and the Moscow "Communist" rulers. The Hitler Fascist group launched its political career with a verbal attack on "Communism." For many years the world was told by the Nazis in shrieking tones that the "Communists" inside and outside Germany, as well as the Jews, represented toxic evils that must be eradicated completely and absolutely from all human society.

Conspicuously, in 1933, Capitalist-democratic Germany became transformed into Capitalist-Fascist Germany, with Hitler at the helm. The anti-"Communist" Nazi propaganda was much enhanced. Suddenly, about six years later, the Nazis and the Stalin bureaucrats, in a calm fashion, stunned the world with the announcement of a "Non-Aggression Pact" between Hitler Germany and "Communist" Russia. The Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty was signed on August 23, 1939. In consequence of this pact, the world understood that neither power posed a threat against the other. The Hitler-Stalin relations quickly went much further than "non-aggression." Following Hitler's attack against Poland, shattering its defenses, Stalin's army, to the open-mouthed astonishment of the whole world, advanced into Poland, and his and Hitler's officers, meeting far inside that defeated country, shook hands in cordiality, dividing it between Capitalist-Fascist Germany and "Communist" Russia.

The Hitler-Stalin "Non-Aggression Treaty," concluded, apparently without any malicious intent on either side, and the partition of Poland, were followed by a sharp reduction of their stream of invectives—just as decades later between Capitalist United States and "Communist" Russia, after the launching of the detente. Astonishingly, the Stalin-Hitler relationship assumed the appearance of peaceful coexistence par excellence.

Stalin, shrewd and adroit in intrigues and plots for personal power but extremely myopic in diplomacy with the world Capitalist leaders, was made to feel very comfortable and, with boyish



naivete, receptive to the "good will" of the Hitler band. Imagining that he stood firmly on expansionist grounds, backed by the immediate heavy presence of the friendly-acting Nazis, Stalin forthwith absorbed into his domain three minor Capitalist countries, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, militantly attacked and, with great difficulty, defeated Finland, and seized Bessarabia from Rumania.

As to Hitler's war against Capitalist-democratic France and England, it was the strangest "conflict" on record. It did not even resemble a real war. Particularly difficult to understand was the situation on the "Western Front" in the light of the terrible military struggle of 1914-18 between Kaiser Germany and the French, British and American powers. In that stubborn bloody storm men fought for every inch of ground. In the Verdun battle alone, begun with a stupendous German bombardment, forts were taken and retaken in savage combat, with nearly a million casualties suffered by both sides. Paris, a first class fortress, many miles from the Front, was bombed with a huge gun named "Big Bertha." But in the 1939 "war" with the French and the British, for eight months, there were no advances to resemble 1914, no bombardments, many days going by without even a rifle shot. Nothing was done to relieve the pressure of the Nazi attack upon Poland, and for seven months after. This markedly incredible "war" was described by some Capitalist sources as the Phony War—"a term of derision in World War II from September 1939 to the spring of 1940 particularly on the Western Front in Europe." ("Phony War," *The War Dictionary* by Louise G. Parry. Consolidated Book Publishers) "The so-called 'phony war' lasted through 1939 and the first part of 1940." (*Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*. Second Edition, 1943. Current History, 310-26)

The perfectly peaceful relationship, disguised by war talk, embracing the Nazi leadership with the High Command of the French and British, lasting two thirds of a year, was suddenly "terminated" by the Nazi forces precipitously occupying, without a serious battle, first Norway, across the sea, with the powerful British navy conveniently out of the way of the Nazi ships, then Belgium and Holland. The cloud of mystery thickened when the Nazis advanced into the heart of France without any attempt by the French generals to stop them. Hitler's forces entered Paris (June 14, 1940) without firing a shot. They passed through Verdun in twenty-four hours. The most puzzling chapter in the history of France culminated with the establishment by General

Pétain, "the hero of Verdun," of a French Fascist Government, collaborating henceforth with the Nazis. The key to the understanding of the enigma of the so-called "Second World War" is the astounding role of France.

How did this drama, so vast in scope, take place? It had started seven years earlier when the Capitalist-democratic President von Hindenburg in January 1933 appointed Hitler Chancellor of Germany. Guided by the strange philosophy that Hitler represented peace, the British and French Governments, with the United States seemingly standing aside, allowed Hitler to scrap the Treaty of Versailles and build the disarmed Germany into a mighty military power. Next, at a secret session at Munich, the head of the Capitalist-democratic Government of Britain, Neville Chamberlain, supposedly carried away naively in pursuit of peace, turned over Czechoslovakia, with its famous, or infamous, great Skoda munitions works, to Hitler. No representatives of "Communist" Russia were present at the Munich talks.

Then occurred the quicker-moving, fantastic events: Hitler's raging attack on Poland, the cordial partition of Poland between Stalin and Hitler, an eight-month Phony War, the opening of the gates of France to the Nazi army by the top French generals. Conspicuously the Nazi military strength grew to gigantic proportions. Now the Hitler war machine, in a dazzling, kaleidoscopic triumph, was supplied by the immense French munitions works with guns, tanks and other military equipment. Soon followed other exciting Nazi military successes, Hitler's occupation, without a real struggle, of the Balkan countries where he obtained food and raw materials for his military enterprise. All these preliminaries to the acme of the Capitalist plan, to employ the Hitler war machine for the destruction of "Communist" Russia, took nearly eight years.

On June 22, 1941, a new event, far greater than the going over of France into the Hitler camp, a world-shaking bolt came out of the purest Hitler-Stalin seemingly friendly blue sky. It took many people several days to recoil from surprise, especially all those who had been lulled to sleep by the official Nazi and Capitalist-democratic war talks, as well as by Stalinist amazing nonsense about the Soviet policy turning Hitler against the Western Capitalist democracies. Breaking his "Non-Aggression Pact" with Stalin, reversing sharply the "friendly" ties with "Communist" Russian bureaucracy, Hitler dashed most of his formidable panzer divisions into Stalin's Poland, occupying it in a few days, and soon unfolded a stupendous invasion of Russia from the Baltic



to the Black Sea. As Hitler's generals had foreseen from Stalin's miserable showing in the lengthy war with little Capitalist Finland, the Russian defenses crumbled along the entire front like so many houses of cards.

Stalin had felt pretty secure under the "protection" of the paper pact with Hitler. Had he been a shrewd, perspicacious diplomat whose relations with international Capitalism bristled with stunningly clear policies calculated on the assumption that sooner or later a war between the two systems was a certainty, there would have been no British-French sellout of Czechoslovakia to the Nazis, no vicious Nazi attack on Poland unopposed by England and France, no passing over of France into the Nazi camp. Stalin would have asserted that a Hitler attack on Poland would constitute a direct threat to Russia, and he would be prepared to meet that threat militarily. Instead, Stalin, like a shark striking at the bait, having broken the pact with France to defend Czechoslovakia, and agreed to violate his non-aggression pact with Poland, accepted the Nazi "gift" of half of Poland.

Stalin's relaxation of vigilance regarding Hitler reached an almost incredible level of absurdity when a few days before the invasion of Russia a Czechoslovak worker, fleeing from the Nazi-occupied Europe, crossed into Stalin territory and excitedly urged the Soviet authorities to inform "Comrade" Stalin of the tremendous Nazi armament concentration he had witnessed on the Soviet frontier. They called Stalin over the phone. He ordered the worker shot. They did.

When the news of the Nazi invasion was broken to Stalin, for a time he lost the faculty of speech. He currently realized, of course that the turning over to "Communist" Russia of half of Poland, the assumed friendly pose of Nazi Germany, were parts of the profoundly engineered scheme to chloroform the Stalin authorities and catch them with their defenses down.

As for the situation between the Nazis and the British, about ten months before Hitler invaded Russia something very curious was started in the Arabian desert lands along the Mediterranean coast. Mussolini, becoming a partner of Hitler in the general picture of "war" with Capitalist democracies, sent troops from Italy to his Marshal Graziani across the sea in Africa. The French fleet was far away from the Italian route, locked up in the port of Toulon. The British Navy was conveniently held back by its admirals from Mussolini's path.

The Marshal started a drive against the British on September 13, 1940, and the British withdrew to Matruh inside the Egyptian

border. Then on December 9, 1940, the British under General Wavell drove the Italians back, marching five hundred miles west across the desert to El Agheila, capturing 133,000 prisoners, the entire Graziani army. But soon the Nazi General Rommel's Afrika Corps, while the British Navy was still absent, landed in Tripoli and drove the British five hundred miles back to Egypt, arriving there by the middle of April 1941. At the end of 1941 the British opened an offensive and Rommel withdrew five hundred miles over the desert to El Agheila which the British entered on January 7, 1942. Two weeks later Rommel pushed the British out of El Agheila. The British withdrawal continued for several hundred miles until Rommel stopped on July 1, 1942 at El Alamein, Egypt. On October 22, 1942 the British under General Montgomery opened a drive against Rommel and at the end of the year the Nazis were in full retreat toward Tripoli. The British and the Americans occupied French North Africa. Tunisia was held by the Nazis. On February 17, 1943 the Americans fell back from Tunisia. That is enough said about the "war" in the West during the first years of the bloodiest war raging in Russia.

That war overshadows everything in military combat in the past three thousand years. It was carried on with an intensity defying description. Fields and roads were drenched with blood and covered with corpses. Probably at least thirty million lives, soldiers and civilians, men, women and children were destroyed. Over seventy thousand towns and villages were razed to the ground, shattered with artillery or air bombardments.

This formidable invasion almost succeeded in its objective. Paradoxically, due to the unspeakable brutalities of the Nazis—not witnessed in the West—the Russian, the Ukrainian, the Jewish and other masses, in utter terror, joined Stalin's Army, worked to exhaustion in the arms factories, to resist the invaders. They acted in complete disregard of the frightful magnitude of sacrifice of life, a practice introduced by Stalin's Marshal Zhukov.

The 1914-18 War was marked by a notable absence of a wide range and highly varied intricate plots and conspiracies against the masses. Shielded and supported by Social Democracy, the Capitalist rulers of the belligerent countries saw no serious reason to fear the workers. The Kaiser Government permitted Lenin to travel from Switzerland through Germany. The German and the Allied leaders shaped their strategy only to win in the bloody struggle. But in the "Second World War," because it was contrived through a far-reaching scheme of the leaders of the big Capitalist powers to end the menace of "Communist" Russia, first



by arming Germany, then through a phase of "friendship" between Hitler and Stalin, and finally, during the Nazi invasion of Russia, disguised with an "alliance" between Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt, extensive and quite persistent scheming was conducted from the beginning to the end. Echoing this fact, columnist William Safire, writing in *The New York Times* of December 9, 1974, tells about the British actor Leslie Howard boarding "an aircraft early in World War II on a secret mission. The Germans knew about it and shot down the unarmed plane. The British knew beforehand that the Germans knew, but to protect the secret of how they knew, British intelligence let the plane go down and the actor died."

The Leslie Howard plane is an important clue to the Nazi-British contacts. The Nazis knew about the plane, the British knew that the Nazis were informed. How to explain this amazing, precise information on both sides? Indicating that he is relying on the book *The Ultra Secret* by a former British intelligence officer, Frederick Winterbotham, Safire says: "The secret was this: The British had cracked the seemingly unbreakable code of the Nazi high command, and were able to read their opponents' top-level messages throughout the war." Wasn't the "seemingly unbreakable code" of the British learned by the Nazis?

Since the Nazis knew about Leslie Howard's plane's destination, and the British high command was aware of that knowledge, would it not be logical to conclude that the catching up with the plane by the Nazis is an indication that they, on their part, had "cracked" the British code? In plain words of logically suspicious thinking, in the midst of the secret manipulations of the Hitlerites and the French generals, the Nazis exchanged the keys to the mutual codes with the British. To the Russian "Communist" leaders both codes remained unknown.

Much has been written about the Nazi air-bombing of London and particularly Coventry. But no one knew at the time those bombings occurred, and for many years later, that when "Field Marshal Goering's Luftwaffe targeted the city of Coventry for saturation bombing . . . Winston Churchill was told of the plan in time to have been able to evacuate Coventry." (Safire)

Shrouding the deals with the Nazis by the French and the British in the obscurity of history, of which Safire probably knows nothing, he records that Churchill's policy was to evacuate certain people from the places designated for destruction by the Nazi airmen and quite heedlessly leave the average citizens and their families to bear the brunt of the Nazi bombings. Moved by

wonderment and astonishment, Safire says: "Breathtaking stuff. Masterful deceit. And the ruthless decisions of Churchill to let men and cities die rather than expose the secret was justified in history."

Safire's remark "was justified in history" is incorrect, from the point of view of Capitalism. When Hitler occupied France, the Balkans, Norway, Czechoslovakia and other countries, they remained within the Capitalist system. "Communist" Russia was in possession only of a shrunken former Tsarist Empire. With the defeat of the Nazis—not in Africa but in "Communist" Russia—Capitalism suffered a really monumental defeat. It lost to "Communism" a large part of Germany, all of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, some northern Japanese islands, Sakhalin, and sometime after the defeat of the Nazis, traceable to "Communism's" victory over Capitalism in Europe, Capitalism lost China, a country of eight hundred million people, North Korea, Cuba, and quite recently, all of Vietnam and Cambodia. Moreover, Capitalism suffered to tolerate the political capture of the working masses by Moscow in Italy and France, and a large "Communist" influence in Japan, India, Africa, in the Middle East and in Latin America. And with the development of nuclear weapons by the Kremlin, Capitalism, considerably reduced in territory since and because of the Nazi debacle, is confronted with the major threat to its life by the Russian bureaucracy. Its claim that it defeated the Nazis in alliance with Moscow has the hollow sound of concealment of the tormentful to it fact of a colossal defeat caused by the defeat of the Nazi war machine in "Communist" Russia.

Thus, up to the point of establishment of "friendly" relations between Capitalist Fascist Germany and "Communist" Russia, following the partition of Poland, the present picture bears a resemblance to Washington-Moscow relations. But what next?

In the apparently friendly Berlin-Moscow connection, Stalin was sound asleep to the game played by Capitalism, but in the Washington-Moscow detente and SALT both sides are keenly aware of the threat they represent to each other. At the bottom of the Stalin-Hitler "Non-Aggression Pact" was a *one-sided* gigantic plot to gun down the Stalinist officialdom, to decimate and terrorize the Russian, Polish, Ukrainian and other masses, to kill off all the Jews, to turn Russia into a German colony and re-establish there private Capitalist ownership of heavy and light industry. As a matter of reported facts, certain factories in the



Soviet territory overrun by the Nazi forces were taken over by German private firms. The American-Russian Capitalist-"Communist" detente does not represent an intricate one-sided plot as a groundwork for wiping out the Soviet Union. Because the powerful Brezhnev gang has digested well Stalin's fantastically overtrustful and incredibly stupid blunder in assuming that Nazi Germany, a Capitalist power, would observe its treaties with "Communism," an anti-Capitalist dominion, and because its nuclear might is as immense as that of the United States, and is steadily expanding, both the Capitalist and the "Communist" rulers would plot against each other. The Breznev gang is dreaming not of a stalemate with Capitalism but of superiority which would lead to the Kremlin's full and final victory. Though Khrushchev is dead, his haughty remark addressed to the American Capitalists, "We'll bury you," has been retained in the memory of the ruling Soviet bureaucrats.

The buildup of targetable warheads, of submarine-launched missiles, of all other machines of nuclear war, by both Moscow and Washington, is growing at a pace suggesting the substantial question: Where does this seemingly insane and apparently endless armament race lead? A direct and open confrontation between the two superpowers would be tantamount to suicide for both. Very few people in the United States and in the Soviet Union, perhaps none, would survive such conflict. Presumably haunted by the threat of this appalling outcome, the ruling cadres of both powers are systematically continuing to pursue the Strategic Armaments Limitation Talks. But each "talk" leads not toward the abandonment of the arms race, not even towards its actual, perceptive limitation, but toward ever heavier increases in the number and strength of the nuclear weapons. Reviewing the dilemma in which the superpowers find themselves, and drawing upon philosophical insight, *The New York Times* of April 11, 1974, in an editorial "SALT in Detente" reflects: "Difficult compromises will have to be made by both sides. It can only be done if there is good will, mutual confidence and a genuine atmosphere of detente."

This remark is not valid by the measurements of history. More treaties, pacts and agreements among governments and various peoples and tribes were broken and violated in various ways than carried out. How much "good will" was there in the policies of the United States in violating its treaties with the Indians? Was there, after the fall of Napoleon, "mutual confidence" in treaties guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, which

the Kaiser disregarded in 1914. His Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg, in that case, quite pointedly described a treaty as a "scrap of paper." What about Hitler casting into the ashtray the Treaty of Versailles? A practical example that a treaty is a scrap of paper was furnished by Stalin in violating his agreement with France to protect Czechoslovakia against the Munich threat of the Nazi occupation, in abrogating his "non-aggression" understanding with Finland, his "non-aggression" pact with Poland. The truth, ignored by the editors of the *Times* is that there can be no "good will, mutual confidence and a genuine atmosphere of detente" in the jungle of nations, and specifically between the chief guardians of Capitalism, the American high financial interests, and the Russian "Communist" dictators.

James Reston, an outstanding columnist of *The New York Times*, observed soberly and somewhat lugubriously: "Both sides have been supporting the notion of 'detente' or 'peaceful coexistence,' but increasing their military budgets while talking about reducing them." (N.Y.T., March 13, 1974)

The newspaper prints an article which is a shade more realistic than certain others, titled "Arms Talks: a Dissent." The author of the dissenting article, Daniel Lang, speaks frankly: "Negotiations that make allowance for the continued manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons aren't worthy of enlisting one's faith and hope." (N.Y.T., May 2, 1974)

But what does the dissenting Lang offer as a solution to the issue of the armaments race? A delusional reply: "Only disarmament—not arms control—will persuade the Soviet and American populations that they are not long-term hostages. Disarmament, though has not been on the agenda in Geneva. . . ."

It is doubtful that Lang does not realize that the placing of disarmament on the agenda in Geneva would have as little real effect as the very talks on limitation of the armament race.

The mockery of the SALT is sliced wide open by the fact, if by nothing else, that no on-the-spot inspection has been included in the agreements stemming from the SALT to verify their implementation. On the whole, the Capitalist writers take a gloomy view of the SALT.

On the Russian side, typically, no Government policy stirs a controversy such as in the early days of Lenin's regime. The masses and the intellectual elements, whose political mentality is misshapen by the self-imposed leaders, are victims of dramatic inculcations that the SALT represents the carefully worked out technique for assuring peaceful coexistence with world Capital-



ism and a survival chance for the Soviet population. Hence, while in Capitalist-democratic America a measure of doubt regarding the real value of the detente and SALT is expressed publicly in the press, the foreign correspondents in Moscow never reported a single instance of questioning the leaders' thesis. Even many, if not all, Soviet dissidents adopt a supporting posture in this respect.

From every aspect of the surfeit of the nuclear weapons, two things ever more sharply are obvious to a rational mind. One, that an undisguised nuclear conflict between the two superpowers, an open kind that for a moment threatened in the Khrushchev-Kennedy crisis in 1962, must be completely ruled out; and the second, that SALT is a singular failure insofar as reaching the reversal or even the stopping of the nuclear race.

What then is there left to do for the gifted seasoned military planners of Capitalism and "Communism"?

There is one scheme which, at first vaguely, then sharply, has been examined, and perhaps is already taking conclusive shape in their plans: a total, bold, utterly conspiratorial blast by one opponent in the SALT against all the adversary's installations.

Surprise in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred counts heavily, often decisively, in a war. Hitler, because of the element of surprise, was almost triumphant over "Communism." Jack Anderson, a columnist who makes his reputation as a revealer of many secrets of the United States administration, has rendered available to the daily reader of the Capitalist press a highly important item on the power of the President. Writing during the Nixon presidency, he reported: "President Nixon is deeply conscious of the terrible power at his fingertips to plunge the world into a nuclear holocaust. 'I could push this button right here and in 20 minutes 70 million Russians would be dead,' he told a secret strategy session on March 8. 'And 25 minutes later, 70 million Americans would be dead,' he added." (*New York Post*, March 22, 1974)

Anderson said nothing about a surprise attack to hit *all* Russian or all American nuclear installations to reduce retaliation to a minimum. The leaders of Capitalist America and of "Communist" Russia are not as absurdly naive as merely to push the nuclear button in brilliant "sunlight" and materialize for both sides the most terrifying mass death in the annals of the species. But if in the political convulsions of the present nuclear era a situation arises pressing for jettisoning the SALT, if the complex, highly sophisticated mechanism of defense is pinpointed to

strike simultaneously by dark "starlight" all the nuclear bases of the rival power, then the fatal button may be pushed, and instead of seventy million, perhaps two hundred million of the American or of the Soviet population would be burned to death.

Quite naturally the side that would use the surprise attack, the victorious side, would rely on its interceptive equipment to destroy every retaliatory missile. A few probably would go through and wreak some havoc. But that gamble the victorious side would have to take. After all, President Kennedy risked a nuclear war with "Communist" Russia during the Cuban crisis in 1962, possessing no highly sophisticated devices to intercept and destroy the retaliatory Soviet missiles. Today these devices are piled up in the arsenals of both superpowers, and the side to release the surprise attack would command the impact to paralyze the adversary.

An argument may be advanced by skeptics, despite the depressing evidence, that the idea of a simultaneous use of a multitude of nuclear bombs is sheerest imagination, unadulterated nonsense. The eye-opening truth is that for many years the build-up of the stockpile of thousands of warheads in Europe by the United States has been guided precisely by this hard, realistic concept: "For 20 years, the stockpile was built up under a strategic concept, which in some ways still applies—that if the need arose to save Western Europe against a Soviet invasion, virtually all the warheads would be used at the same time." (*N.Y.T.*, Sept. 23, 1973)

The notion of a surprise nuclear attack by one superpower against the other has appeared frequently in the Capitalist press. Dealing with Senator Thomas J. McIntyre's amendment to a military procurement bill, *The New York Times* of June 5, 1974, reported: "If the United States had weapons posing a threat to the Soviet intercontinental missile force, he argues, then Moscow might be tempted in a period of international tension to strike first, thus producing what he describes as 'an international Wild West filled with fears and dangers of a nuclear "fast gun."'"

In its June 10, 1974 issue *The New York Times* pointed out the change in the Pentagon strategy: "Almost unnoticed by the country and little debated in the Congress, a dangerous and drastic transformation of American nuclear strategy is in the making. From a long-standing policy of deterrence—based on a stable, second strike, retaliatory force—the Pentagon is now seeking a silo-killing capability that the Soviet union may perceive as a first-strike force."



If in 1962 the Kremlin knew it was relatively weaker in nuclear strength than the United States to confront Kennedy's challenge, with a valid conceit, the Moscow rulers realize that they are as strong as their American opponents, and that their interlocking phalanx of nuclear personnel and weaponry is as overwhelmingly impressive as is the American.

A cover factor in the situation entangling both superpowers is their discussions and the signing of treaties. But what their agreements offer is so far from the essential facts in actual life that one is led to conclude that with every treaty the holocaust, paradoxically, is brought closer. As Herbert Scoville, Jr., Secretary of the Arms Control Association writes: "The risk that we will be incinerated in a nuclear holocaust has been immeasurably increased by the Moscow underground-test treaty." (*New York Times*, July 11, 1974)

On November 24, 1974 President Ford and "Communist" chief Brezhnev met in Vladivostok, and reached an agreement. Almost at once the Vladivostok accord "has produced skepticism and outright opposition. . . ." (*N.Y.T.*, Nov. 25, 1974). The phrase in the agreement "further limitation" was shown to imply further *growth* of armaments! Senator Jackson "said he feared that instead of doing anything to slow the arms race, the accord would impel the United States to replace the current force of land-based Minuteman missiles with larger ones to offset the Soviet advantage at an additional cost of billions of dollars." (*N.Y.T.*, Nov. 28, 1974)

Discussing the situation several months later the newspaper concluded: "A surprise attack by little more than half the Soviet force could threaten to destroy the bulk of America's ICBM's, leaving the other half of the Soviet MIRV force in its silos to deter American retaliation against Soviet cities. A similar American capability would increase the menace of 'crisis instability'—fear on both sides that in a crisis the other might shoot first." (*N.Y.T.*, Feb. 11, 1975)

As matters are shaping up, the world, amidst its Middle East, Southeast Asian and general turbulence and madness, is being carried, falteringly but unmistakably, toward either "Communist" or Capitalist nuclear first-strike attack—and victory of one side in the armament race over the other.

More and more it appears that Moscow already has an edge of advantage over Washington. *The New York Times* takes a gloomy view of conditions abroad: "Soviet arms in Indochina and Syria, Soviet diplomacy in the Middle East and Soviet-

oriented Communist parties in Portugal and Italy have all contributed to a gradual destabilization of the world situation, from Saigon to Jerusalem. The NATO-Warsaw Pact talks in Vienna on mutual force reductions have bogged down, as have the Soviet-American negotiations to limit underground nuclear tests. The collapse of Cambodia and South Vietnam have turned tension into trauma, at least for the United States." (Editorial, *N.Y.T.*, May 5, 1975)

If matters continue to move in the direction they have been in the last few decades, it would not be too venturesome to predict that the nuclear victory may very well go to "Communism." Stalin, after his stupendous victory over Capitalist Fascist Germany, staged an immense "Parade of Victory" through the Red Square in Moscow. The wreckage of tens of thousands of Soviet towns and tens of millions of the bodies of the dead just buried, were momentarily forgotten by the triumphant bureaucracy. From the point of view of Stalin's successors in the Kremlin, no price would be too high to pay for having a thrilling military victory display in the Red Square, celebrating the undreamed of decades ago, seemingly impossible, triumph over the powerful Capitalist United States of America. The jubilation of the bureaucracy would be especially fantastically enthusiastic because that defeat would mark the end of Capitalism and the full emergence of "Communism" over the entire globe.

But, actually, what sort of victory would that be? What kind of political, economic, social and ideological conditions would the victorious "Communist" marshals bring to the occupied lands? Every victorious power establishes in the country it conquers a state of affairs similar to those in its home country. This is especially true about the "Communist" power. What is the situation within the population of the Soviet Union today? What is the physical and, quite important, the emotional state of the Soviet society?

Today the Soviet Union harbors millions of emotionally disturbed men and women, even children. Its cities are dotted with numerous asylums for the insane, which house not only the mentally sick but, by the order of high authority, also political prisoners to break their spirit and physical health through a scientifically harsh treatment. There are millions of hopeless alcoholics, countless hashish victims. Above, over the toiling population stands an enormous host of careerist flunkies, serving the top figures of power, that guide all the institutions of the State. This host is invested with great authority delegated from the



Kremlin. Many of this colossal body are drunkards, crooks and unashamed liars, but more or less sophisticated in their lines of concrete service in offices, plants and shops. It performs the role of eager slavedriver, pressing the workers to exert every ounce of energy to increase and broaden industrial production so that the men in the upper tier of the bureaucratic tower surpass in every field the American Capitalists. This is the expressed goal of the bureaucracy.

To break up the bureaucratic host into its basic components, it consists of Government officials who manipulate the body politic, carrying out the line handed down to them from the Kremlin, supervisors of economy, professors, prison wardens, journalists, poets and other prostitutes of the pen, high medical personnel, officers of the Red Army, Navy and Air Force, captains and mates of the merchant fleet, scientists and other elevated professionals.

This upper caste of Soviet society enjoys many privileges relished by the former Capitalists and the aristocracy. The bureaucracy employs hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of domestic servants. It obtains the most expensive attire, the finest foods, occupies the best, most commodious apartments, owns dachas-estates in the rural parts of the country, swimming pools, sculptures, paintings and other rich furnishings for its homes, libraries, fine private automobiles. Brezhnev, an auto enthusiast, owns several cars. In 1972 he received from President Nixon a Cadillac, in 1973 a Lincoln Continental, each costing \$10,000, and in 1974, by his specific request, a sporty Chevrolet Monte Carlo, "the car of the year." Besides this private luxury, Brezhnev owns a personal hunting lodge at Zavidovo, about eighty miles from Moscow.

Beneath the kaleidoscopic elements of the upper levels there is the Soviet toiling population. It lives a grueling, hand-to-mouth existence. It, as well as the exploiting privileged caste, is repressed in political thinking under the threat of imprisonment for as little as a phrase construed as a criticism of the official policy. Its public and personal life is under perpetual surveillance by Brezhnev's secret agents.

The Soviet Union covers an eighth of the planet's surface. Lenin was the first "Communist" dictator of this territorially largest State on earth. He, and after him, Stalin, made it an enormous prison camp which, following the death of this terrible despot, in 1953, was taken over by Stalin's closest lieutenants. Of the two hundred and twenty-five million, or so, of

gagged and blindfolded people, most of them with an unfailing sense of personal safety, are reconciled to their fate but many long to escape, to emigrate to a Capitalist-democratic country. The Jews, unofficially hounded by the ruling circle, are seeking to depart for Israel, even though that State is too minute to accommodate them in large numbers, and is periodically facing war, threatened with the fate of being destroyed and its Jewish population wiped out in blood. But the Soviet Jews, as well as other nationalities, including the Russian people itself, are steel-belted in this immense "Communist" prison-State by extremely proficient armed guards on its long and winding borders.

The initials U.S.S.R. stand for "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." Analysis shows, first, that the word "Union" is a deception, carrying the false impression of a union of equals. In reality the national components of the State are dominated by one power, Russia, with the others completely subservient to the rule and policy of Moscow. Second, it is not a true Soviet government, because the authentic Soviet power was decapitated by Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and other top Bolshevik leaders on the night of the overthrow of the Capitalist Provisional Government. The present Soviets represent an organ of the bureaucracy, not the historic form of the proletarian government so enthusiastically described by Lenin immediately upon their formation, followed by him with the categorical slogan "All Power to the Soviets." The fact that all the other "Communist" States, including China and Yugoslavia, did not establish a Soviet form, proves the fraud of "Soviet power" in Russia. The Soviets could be completely eliminated, like the vermiform appendix in the human body, and the one-man dictatorship would not be perturbed in the slightest way. Is it a Socialist State? The old ideal of Socialism implied the introduction of true workers' democracy, elimination of the division of society into a privileged and an underprivileged part, an environment which puts an end to all injustice, a social order which, beginning with the introduction of the right to exercise the revolutionary tradition of debate and dissent from the majority opinion, at a scope even broader than existed in the first phase of Lenin's regime in 1917, would expand the dimension of this freedom of expressing individual opinion regarding the policy of the democratically-elected officials. "Communist" Russia, yet under Lenin, greatly stifled, instead of expanding this right, resorted to cheap tricks as in the case of Kollontai's pamphlet, and under Stalin rigorously wiped it out, meanwhile continuing to call itself "Union of Soviet Socialist



Republics."

True Socialism would put an end to one-sex domination of society and would pursue a genuine equality of the sexes in a bisexual structure of the State and of conduct of life in a numerical half-and-half, men and women, system of administration. Neither is "Communist" Russia a republic. A genuine republic is a State in which the sovereignty resides in the electorate, a true representative democracy. "Communist" Russia is ruled through an iron dictatorship of one person, always a male since it was founded, representing nationally only *Russian* interests, even though it was tyrannically supervised for nearly three decades not by a Russian but by a Georgian named Djugashvili, alias Russian-sounding "Stalin."

The system of strangling the critical mentality in "Communist" Russia has covered a great distance from the period of the Tenth Party Congress at which Lenin legalized repression of criticism of the "Communist" chief of State. Under Brezhnev persecution, always dreadfully tragic, assumes once in a while a ludicrous aspect. Such was the violent disruption by Brezhnev's men of an outdoor show of "modern art," a craft which is the most nebulous of all conveyers of ideas, a vehicle of sheer abstractions, of grotesque and somber fantasies.

The instant reaction of the Capitalist-democratic press abroad to the incident was biting. *The New York Times* in an editorial castigated the perpetrators of the suppressing outrage: "The Soviet Union will not soon live down the spectacle, witnessed by an international crowd including diplomats, of young Communist thugs, obviously under orders, trampling down, ripping up or splashing with mud and hauling off in dump trucks the work of noted artists, some of whose paintings have been exhibited in New York and other major cultural centers. Some newsmen were among those beaten up by vigilantes." (*N.Y.T.*, Sept. 17, 1974)

In response, a few days later, the Brezhnev authorities momentarily realized that they had acted not only distastefully, but plainly idiotically. In their museums and art galleries they display pictures and sculptures far more impressively pro-Capitalist, even glorifying the bloody House of Romanovs, than the "modern art" has ever been. So they reversed themselves—temporarily, released the arrested artists and told them they were allowed to hold an outdoor exhibition of their art.

The show was held on September 29, 1974, and was attended by a huge crowd, despite the fact that all information about the

forthcoming exhibition had been withheld by the "Communist" press. The artists had spread the information about the forthcoming show by means of typed invitations—an extremely limited publicity. How could such thick crowds converge on the exhibition through this narrow channel of communication? A Moscow student explained to a foreign correspondent: "Thanks to your foreign broadcasts and foreign press articles, people found out where to come to see this art!" (*N.Y.T.*, Sept. 30, 1974)

Was it just curiosity that attracted a mass of Russian people to see the half-forbidden art? Obviously not. It was also a tragic feeling of a "breath of fresh air" that they suddenly could draw in the Soviet Union—and, ironically enough, with the aid of Capitalist press reporters.

But this was not the last chapter in the story. After responding to the pressure of the Capitalist press and of their own for a minute soberness by going out of their way to allow the exhibition, the Soviet inquisitors became uneasy over their sudden "tolerance," again reversed themselves and went after these unfortunate artists. A dispatch from Moscow reported: "Soviet authorities have begun a campaign to disband and intimidate a group of unofficial artists that staged a successful outdoor exhibition of nonconformist art late in September, a spokesman for the artists said tonight . . . while others have been subjected to threats, interrogations, eviction, dismissal from work and temporary arrest. One has been placed in a mental hospital." (*N.Y.T.*, Nov. 18, 1974)

The threat of being imprisoned in a mental institution has been hanging for years over the heads of the Soviet people. Every now and then this method of punishment is recorded by the foreign correspondents in Moscow. Thus, a dispatch by Reuters on July 8, 1970 reported: "Young Russian poet Natalya Gorbachevskaya has been declared not responsible for her actions after being investigated for allegedly anti-Soviet slander. The Moscow City Court decided that she should be detained in a mental institution, sources said."

The State, which boasts the emblem of hammer and sickle, a fraud, purportedly representing the interests of the toilers of land and factory, is poisoned with Great Russian chauvinism even to a vaster degree than the society under the heinous Romanovs. It is crime-ridden from the former Tsar's palaces in the Kremlin, now housing the business offices of the "Communist" usurper, to the city streets which are meticulously swept



and washed by working *women* under the false "equality of the sexes." Back in 1917, after the fall of the Tsar, the chief topics of conversation were political issues. In the early period of the Lenin regime, even the backward masses, young and old, talked about the problem of the bureaucratic disease; and in the Party members discussed whom to support, Lenin or the Opposition. In the Brezhnev period, however, a correspondent reported from Moscow, " 'You cannot imagine,' said a middle-aged woman, 'this is topic No. 1 wherever you go, in restaurants, in apartments, at work. Everyone is talking about crime on the streets. It's like New York, isn't it.' " (N.Y.T., Oct. 29, 1974)

Early in November 1974 a dispatch from Moscow reported: "Moscow's police chief announced on television today that two women were slain last month during a rash of muggings. . . . The reports have led many Moscow women to stay indoors after dark." (N.Y.T., Nov. 4, 1974)

But these muggings and killings in the streets of the U.S.S.R., committed under the cover of night, are superficial pinpricks compared with the boundless, bloodcurdling mass atrocities perpetrated by the men at the helm of the State under the ideological cloak of "Socialism." It should be noted that never did a pseudo-Socialist tendency flush so dazzling and at the same time so calamitous a snare over so vast a part of human kind as does the "Communist" bureaucracy today.

After its possible victory over Capitalism, no longer encumbered by consideration for the Capitalist intellectuals abroad, the Kremlin's salient mastery of the globe would be reinforced with a chain of death camps of the *Gulag Archipelago* type, sophisticated in the techniques of torture, exploding with tens of millions of victims. To most of the young sufferers the large truth of the night of the October Revolution, of the precipitous degeneration of the leaders of Bolshevism would be out of reach. No one would be near to inform them. But perhaps a few older prisoners, perishing in despair and keen disillusionment, would peruse the totality of high hopes and expectations of the Socialists of the Nineteenth Century, of the workers, sailors and soldiers of 1917 and would review the steadily declining positive texture of the immense mass upheaval in Russia and the transformation of a cascade of leadership, unequalled in apparent purity and integrity by anything that had ever appeared in the old Socialist movement, into a loathsome cesspool of the worst traitors to Socialism.

If this, anti-Semitically tinged, abominable, and thus far ex-

tremely viable "Socialism" replaces Capitalism and consolidates its gruesome grip over America, it will be the crowning of an extraordinary criminal social system, matched by very corrupt societies in history, to last a century or longer, a shocking triumph of a hideously oppressive and cynical male bureaucracy over all the former Capitalists, a Russian bold stroke over all other nationalities, and a sharp and heavy whip over its own and the world's toiling masses.

\* \* \*

But would homo sapiens register a day of the birth of true liberation, of public and personal security, even a slight measure of felicity, if the hour of triumph over "Communism" would be celebrated joyfully, with ringing of bells, with music and song, by Capitalist United States? Could the authentic meaning of such conquest be judged through the careful perusal of the concrete picture of contemporary America?

This large dominion, with the highest standard of living in the world, nay, in history, is a paradise for the rich, for the middle class, for the aristocracy of labor. But is it a celestial abode for the poor, for the aged, for the unemployed, for the people of black skin, for the underprivileged men and women agricultural laborers? Is it a colorful assemblage living in peaceful cooperation and comfort, in freedom from care, from a drain on the nerves? The many faceted, real picture of the United States shows that in this wealthiest land on earth lives a sick society under a system which counts tens of millions of men and women, even children, mentally ill, jamming the offices of psychiatrists to the very doors, millions of men and women, and adolescents, drinking themselves into a condition of alcoholism, millions enslaved to addiction to drugs, millions of men and women, and millions of teenagers, despairingly looking for a job. It is a community plagued with racial discord, rocked by robberies, rapes, murders, kidnappings, suicides, scandals in commerce and industry, graft and other forms of corruption in the police, deviations from rectitude in the high State personnel, in every economic and social avenue. The psychology of this society is fed with shocking, nerve-wrecking violence in the dramatic showings on the television, on the screen, with the brutal boxing sport, which is a carryover of the bloody gladiatorial games of imperial Rome.

In America today at the fall of darkness people fear to step out of their homes, just as in "Communist" Russia. A very



beautiful woodland covering a large area in the middle of the city of New York, the famous Central Park, is not too safe in the daytime, but is deadly at nights. Many parks and squares throughout the country are hangouts of pickpockets, homosexuals, panhandlers, muggers, derelicts, and drunks. The country is absorbed in a strenuous "rat race," and many in it become rats themselves. There is wild gambling on horses, speculative gambling on the stock exchange, "Las Vegas nights" gambling in churches and synagogues, numerous gambling casinos and houses. In realm of murder, the decadence of Capitalist America has reached into the midst of children. Thus: "Not only has there been more violence, but it also has been increasing by young children. Seven-year-olds and 8-year-olds, for example, have been taken into custody for rape, robbery and assault this year. One murder was attributed to an 8-year-old boy, another to a 9-year-old girl and a third to a 10-year-old boy." (N.Y.T., Nov. 4, 1974) In an editorial "Young Criminals" the paper speaks of "The appalling statistics of violent crimes committed by minors. . . ." (March 4, 1975)

Worthy of a special note is the situation that the Government itself could be charged with the crime of indirectly being involved in aiding and abetting protectionism, as can be deduced from the following. The Government severely persecutes the drug merchants, and when certain canned foods are found to be dangerous to health, the officials order the withdrawal of such merchandise from the market. But the tobacco business, which induces cancer, heart disease, and other ailments, serious and minor, is taken under the protective, even assisting Government wing. The reason for this attitude is that the tobacco industry represents a heavy financial investment, and, besides, it is paying the Government an enormous tax. So, instead of playing the policy of protection of public health straight by prohibiting the growing of the tobacco crop as merchandise and the marketing of the "obnoxious weed," the Government made an arrangement with the billionaires of the poison industry that they insert into their romantically alluring cigarette advertisement the following notice: "Warning: the Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking is Dangerous to Your Health." This, in itself insignificant device considering the magnitude of the problem, is usually so inconspicuously placed on cigarette packs and inserted in the extravagantly sentimental, large-print advertisements that perhaps out of a thousand purchasers of cigarettes only one reads it, and of a few hundred who read it,

fewer than ten rely on it as an accurate dependable piece of information.

Yet, when the report of the Surgeon General was published the sale of cigarettes came down sharply. This indicated that even without restrictive measures, a real anti-tobacco drive, based on up-to-date medical research, would have constituted a vital factor in combatting the evil. But the United States Government did not heed the voice of the Surgeon General, did not proceed with the treatment drive. The tobacco magnates, quite perturbed, opened a vast campaign to bolster their poison-industry. Numerous new brands were thrown by them upon the market. A hurricane of diverse-colored publicity blazoned across the country. The strongest hypnotic-to-read story was the one telling the victims about the "low-tar" cigarette. Buoyed up by this campaign the increase in cigarette sales passed all expectations.

Congressmen, Senators, and other Capitalist politicians, the Capitalist press, are all aware of the terrible injury to the health of the population tobacco causes. But they all bow to the powerful kings of the tobacco industry. *The New York Times*, recognizing the evil, has as little to offer against tobacco as it has against the armament race. In its January 2, 1975 issue, it says:

"The alarming increase in cigarette smoking by girls barely into their teens—despite health warnings on packs and occasional health commercials on television—should alert Congress, state legislators and city authorities that new approaches are essential to diminish this serious hazard to the nation's health."

Probably the Government officials noticed the broad clinical grasp of the *Times*, and early in March 1975 the Federal Trade Commission admitted that the warning on the cigarette packs and in the advertisements was ineffective. Since the warning was first introduced the sale of cigarettes has been growing until, in 1974, it was estimated to have reached more than 602 billion. But what did the Commission set out to do to reverse the situation? Did it propose a practical struggle against the production and sale of the plant that carries narcotic poisoning? No, it merely recommended to change the wording of the warning to read: "Warning: Cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer, coronary heart disease, chronic bronchitis, pulmonary emphysema and other diseases."

Of course, this "revolutionary" approach left the nicotine poisoning of the American population undisturbed. In plain words, the United States Government, shielding the vast finan-



cial interests of the tobacco industry, is guilty of sabotaging the efforts of the responsible section of the medical profession to conquer cancer and other diseases traceable to nicotine as the source.

But more than that. By extension of logical deduction, would not an uncorrupted, uninfluenced by vested interests court of justice charge the United States Government, and all other governments, both Capitalist and "Communist"—the Government of the Soviet Union derives tremendous income from cigarettes—with the heinous crime of aiding and abetting in the demise of millions of their citizens through nicotine-causing cancer and heart disease? As far as the Soviet Government, since there is no private tobacco industry in "Communist" Russia, could not the ruling circle be charged with promoting these fatal diseases and with being direct murderers of millions of Soviet men and women through the manufacture and sale of cigarettes?

Everything American industry produces is for sale, is a source of profit, but the largest profit is derived from merchandise sold by American manufacturers is not in the category of foodstuffs, or clothing, cars, or agricultural machinery. The biggest profit is drawn from the sale of *armaments*! As an informative editorial in *The New York Times* records:

"The world economy may be heading for a slump, but the international arms trade is booming. The world market leader in this unsavory competition is the United States which, in the fiscal year that ended last month, sold some \$8.5 billion in arms, almost doubling its sales in a single year. . . . The Soviet Union appears on its way to boosting its arms exports from \$2 billion to \$3 billion. Other Communist countries in Eastern Europe are likely to sell about \$1 billion worth of weapons this year, and the Western European capitalist countries should be good for about \$3 billion." ("Booming Arms Trade," editorial, *N.Y.T.*, July 13, 1974)

While the rotteness, the duplicity, the general oppression by the "Communist" usurpers, with their horrendous *Gulag*, are covered up, starting with Lenin's lie on the night he stole power from the Congress of Soviets "We will now proceed to construct a Socialist society" and continuing under Brezhnev's gang "We have reached Socialism. We will now proceed toward the first phase of Communism," the multi-sided filth, corruption and shameful ugliness in the mainstream of the social life of Capitalist America is maintained behind the fixed forms of expression which give ground for hope that conditions would completely

change, in a short while, for the good. One of the promising resolutions is "Make America Beautiful."

In its natural environment *America is beautiful*. The splendor of its lush valleys, Shenandoah and others, its numerous lakes, gleaming with radiance, its quiet and its wild scenic streams and rivers, its charmingly swelling landscapes, the forest-clad Green Mountains of Vermont, the hardwood forests of the Appalachians, of its shrouded in mist gorgeous Great Smokey Mountain National Park, the Ozark National Forest, the relatively unspoiled, magnificent Indiana Dunes, California's Sierra Nevada, of the bristlecone trees, 4,600 years of age, the most singular oldest trees on earth, still "young" and growing, of the Californian White Mountains, the majestic panorama of the soaring Mount Olympus, the lofty, rugged snow-capped peaks of the Rockies, the marvelous Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, the awesomely exquisite two-million-acre Yellowstone National Park which covers the land of the grizzly bear, and dazzles with the greatest concentration of geysers in the world, the rounded domes of the Yosemite, the Everglades, the roaring Niagara Falls, of the remarkable Russel Cave, the abode of the primitive human being of America nine thousand years ago, of the glittering stalactites and stalagmites of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park of New Mexico, of the Marengo Cave in Indiana, of Booth's Amphitheatre in the Mammoth Cave in Kentucky, which is over a hundred million years old and is the largest cave system on earth, and, of all the craftsmanship of nature, the crowning giant glory of the planet's natural grandeur, the superb Grand Canyon, the immensity of which can hardly be grasped either by the eye or by the mind, a phenomenon which holds a two-billion-years' record of the geological evolution of America, with its unmistakable signs of the primordial sea, its ages-sculptured high limestone walls, with the furious roaring waters of the Colorado River plunging into the chasm, and of a thousand other, still unspoiled natural treasures—indeed, the splendors of these astounding gems of American wilderness, to which no words of poets and no brushes of artists can do real justice, are unsurpassed. More! They are not equalled by any other country. All together this exciting, intricate fabric of nature makes a startling, colossal spectacle that would take months, even years, to unroll fully before a rapt, fascinated spectator. The usual tourist, almost bewildered by the gigantic, multicolored panorama, barely examines its dizzying, almost hypnotic surface. Because the continental United States environmentally is a



fantastic wilderness of unique, distinctive freshness and beauty, its seasons are different in many aspects from seasons in other countries. America is rich in radiance and splendor in the spring, when the lush fields and meadows burst into a riot of colors, when the trees, exploding into green, compete among themselves for sunlight, when the temperature continually climbs higher and higher, when nature is awake, plants bloom and grow, starting in the first half of May. America is magnificent in the summer, decorated with delicate, tender blooms, teeming with wild life in the prairies, in the swamps, in the marshes and forests, even in the sun-drenched deserts. Having baked the ground with the warm sun, the summer marches past, and is replaced by somewhat melancholy, overcast, sometimes very wet, but generally crisp and enchanting fall. The leaves are floating down from the trees, there are many lovely sunny days and not a few clear nights of moonlit sky, and a frosty chill moves through the air. And then, suddenly, yet right on schedule, comes winter. Rocked by severe storms and blizzards a large part of America is swathed in white, the rampant, swift rivers and the thundering waterfalls become ice-bound, and most of nature goes to sleep under the unbroken canopy of the ashen sky, or, when the days are clear, below the dim glow of the cold, silent sun, and, at night, beneath the mute, sparkling stars. But a new, vigorous spring is on its way, to work a metamorphosis during the weeks ahead. All the snow and ice will soon melt, thousands of brooks and streams will awaken from their frigid slumber. And presently, after the April thunderstorms, the sky will turn a deep blue. The new spring, stepping in the footprints of the one a year before, will proudly reopen the miracle chest of nature and will unfurl in profusion and in multiplicity of colors the spectacular physical beauty of the American woodlands, of the rolling hills, of the pine-covered mountains, and of the immense open spaces, all abounding not only in verdure but also in wild, throbbing animal life.

Between the Atlantic and the Pacific there is the widest variety of natural charm for each State. Individually each represents a corner of the continental picture of spring. A columnist of *The New York Times*, Tom Wicker, in an article "One More Spring" writes with understandable enthusiasm:

"Spring has come to North Carolina in the annual riot of color. Along the highways and in the well-tended front yards of towns and cities, dogwood, azaleas and redbud are blooming brilliantly against the green backdrop of pine trees. No state is more beau-

tiful in the season of renewal although here as elsewhere rejuvenation seems more the property of Mother Earth than of her human creatures." (*N.Y.T.*, April 18, 1975)

Summer is gradually approaching, accenting its arrival with charming blossoms and greenery, the brilliant sun dappling the woods, the exceptionally white clouds of varied contours swiftly floating across the azure dome of the sky, chasing one another and changing the shape of their imaginary objects every two-three minutes. And at the light of dawn comes the thrilling chorus of the birds. It rises to a crescendo as the day fades away, in the breathtaking sunset of turquoise and crimson, or orange and gold, while the delightfully gentle breezes blow over the serene, undulating green grass which carpets the fields.

Yes, in its natural surroundings America, still retaining much of the aura and allure of its magnificent past, is very beautiful—ininitely more beautiful, even strikingly so, than every other country in the world! Sumptuous in minute detail of the stunning masterwork of nature, extraordinarily inviting in its picturesque horizons, America is the most photographed land on the planet.

But the system of human living in America, conducted, supervised and manipulated by the magnates of industry and finance whose basic domestic and foreign policies are carried out officially or surreptitiously by their top politicians, is unspeakably sordid. Under their economic, political, social and military mismanagement the ugly Capitalist life can never be made beautiful no matter how much embellishing art, music, fictitious love and other aspects of their culture the Capitalists cause to be poured on canvass, screen, stage, and on the shelves of their bookshops. While the Capitalists and their politicians do enjoy the wild beauty of America and use it to uplift their disturbed spirit, to buoy up their nerves, the industrialists and the merchants in the Capitalists ranks also employ it to decorate their wares to attract customers. But aside from this, the Capitalists use the American natural loveliness to trim and "beautify" the ugliness of their system. Having been concentrating on acquisition of profits for generations, the American Capitalists have reduced many beautiful sites to very unsightly spots, have soiled thousands of springs, lakes and other bodies of water with factory wastes and other refuse. To cite an example, it is enough to mention the ruination the Capitalists brought to the glory of Lake Superior. The "Father of Waters," one of the largest rivers on the planet, draining over 40% of the territory of the United



States, the great and legendary Mississippi, which for hundreds of centuries carried pure, drinking water along most of its course, has been filled in a few decades of highly developed Capitalism with purest garbage. The few streams and springs which thus far have escaped industrial pollution and therefore still carry water fit to drink represent an echo of long, long ago, not a promise of a salubrious Capitalist future. The distinctive process runs generally in one direction, with a step back in an attempt to return the land to its original state, or to halt deterioration, but with ten steps in despoiling and ruining nature's beauty of the American continent.

To broaden the observation, it is necessary to state that conditions would be similar in pollution of water, land and air if America fell under the heel of the "Communist" dictators. In the publication *Modern Medicine*, the Center for Disease Control, in Atlanta, reported a survey of tourists to "Communist" Russia, showing that one out of five visiting Leningrad developed *giazdiasis*, a form of severe diarrhea, caused, it was concluded, by the water they drank in the U.S.S.R.

The United States' Capitalists, to a remarkable degree, contaminated also the sea waters around the American shores, and poisoned the air over the densely overpopulated American cities. And they have decimated or completely destroyed numerous species. In plain, they have ruined beyond immediate, or even distant, recovery, much of the natural loveliness of the enchanting continent, and would have completed the work of ruination in pursuit of profit were it not for the esthetic fury of the outraged bourgeois environmentalists who indignantly and perseveringly fought against the big manufacturers to save what remains of the natural grandeur of America.

But aside from all that damage, the recent and the present Capitalist masters of American society transformed the relatively simple conditions of life under the last decades of the Nineteenth Century into a Twentieth Century complex, deadly jungle in which an overwhelming majority of the decent and honest population, particularly the aged, are helpless victims of a numerically considerable, vicious due to capitalist conditions, criminal minority, which includes a growing number of children.

The big cities of Capitalist America have a facade occupied or used by the wealthy and the middle-income families, and a hind section inhabited by the poor and the underprivileged. The luxurious front section has an air of cosy comfort and affluence. Attractive, largest in the world department stores many floors

high with goods from every region of the earth, artistically furnished, fabulous cafes and restaurants, almost all serving meals of highest quality with champagne and other expensive beverages, in a pleasant, romantic setting, majestic hotels, elegant and costly entertainment facilities with apparently prosperous clientele, and the finest, opulent residences, all protected to an extent against the prevailing soot and dirt of the city. And not a very great distance away is the rear part, the tenements housing the people of the low and the lowest income, and of hardly any income, many living on welfare, in decaying buildings, actually slums, infested with rats, mice and cockroaches, surrounded with vast accumulations of filth and trash. And curiously, deep behind the walls of both sections of these big, Capitalist cities there prevail, and grow, much trouble, much misery, and profound, often desperate unhappiness.

Such are the big cities of Capitalist America, and not only of Capitalist America but also of Capitalist England, France, Japan, West Germany, Italy—and substantially of "Communist" Russia, where the autocratic, uncrowned head of the State, with his Ministers, formerly "Commissars," his marshals and the rest of his entourage, and the general bureaucratic cream of Soviet Society, live like the Capitalists and the nobility of old, while the toiling masses, the descendants of those who fought to overthrow privilege, favors and special prerogatives, occupy the buildings that were beginning to fall apart yet in the days of the Tsar. Only a small number of new apartments, which are not too well constructed, either, are given, after a long wait, to a few workers, demonstrating to the led-by-the-nose tourists, whose beclouded mental eye does not see even the nose, that "Socialism" is victoriously on the march. And how can the leading "Communist" aristocrats schedule a dramatically extensive building program, how can they fulfill the daily requirements of the working population when they are directing, quite feverishly, the productive forces into making arms for sale in competition with the United States, when they engage the workers in producing billions of dollars' worth of guns, tanks, planes to contribute actually to pay for playing a major part in the power game against the United States in the Mediterranean!

If in the wretched Capitalist world the realization of profit from tobacco sales by the manufacturers of cancer and heart disease hinges upon the exploitation of the captive adult smokers and the cultivation of fresh victims, especially among the heedless of the terrible danger boys and girls, the extraction of



profit from the sale of military equipment by the merchants of death depends upon currently running war, threat of new wars, and rivalry in the present jungle of States. That is why "We don't exactly like being labeled 'international warmongers,' said an FMC spokesman." (U.S. Arms Exports Boom, Particularly to the Mideast, *N.Y.T.*, April 14, 1975). The long-established nickname for these people and their unsavory merchandise is known the world over. The boom in the sale of arms "has revived the label of war profiteer which weapons manufacturers wish to avoid. 'It's that old "merchant of death" stigma' said one Defense Department official." (Ibid.)

An indignant reader of *The New York Times*, in a letter to the editor, writes: "The time is past due for the people and Congress of this country to put the clamps on the cynical, self-serving practices of the munitions-making minority who so coolly jeopardize the lives of us all along with their own." (*N.Y.T.*, May 13, 1975)

Neither the editor nor any of the Congressmen commented on this statement.

Something that is incidental in the international arms trade is the fact that the "Communist" leaders of the Soviet Union keep their participation in the traffic of weapons of mass destruction of human life a strict secret. Yet they quite brazenly attempt to discredit their political cousins in Peking by disclosing that "Communist" China is flooding the Capitalist countries with opium, particularly the United States. A dispatch from Moscow reports: "The current issue of a magazine published by the Kom-somol, or Young Communist League, carries an article on narcotics traffic. . . . The article, in *Molodaya Guardia*, asserts that China's trade in narcotics has grown to more than double her official foreign trade turnover and that the Chinese are responsible for most of the heroin that is sold in the United States." (*N.Y.T.*, Nov. 18, 1974)

In the event of victory of the American very influential small minority "peace-loving" merchants of death over a very large and very powerful minority of the Russian "peace-loving" merchants of death, Washington's generals would take over the administrative powers in the United States. Capitalist democracy, which allows a certain latitude of critical speaking and writing against Capitalism, against the Government, would be liquidated for many decades, perhaps for all time—a terrible step downward for the human race. Military Capitalist dictatorships, galloping wildly, would pockmark the globe, becoming

the only form of government extant. Concentration camps on the pattern created by Hitler would be a universal phenomenon. They would be jammed with people of various political beliefs. Among these would be the Liberals, whose sentimental ideas have been a tragic miscarriage, with adherents of Socialist parties, whose "Socialism" has been no more than an empty slogan, but primarily with the deceived, darkly ignorant workers, peasants and intellectuals of the "Communist" and the Trotskyite organizations, and with the members of various "Liberation" bands, individual fanatical pseudo-revolutionists, some either half or completely deranged, and with what remains of the Anarchists.

The victory of the cunning and secretive American munition trust over the Russian "Communist" crafty and bemasked usurpers would register the ascendancy of undiluted with reforms male supremacy, reinforcing for many more centuries the role of the female as a "respected" auxiliary to the undisputed masculine control of human existence. It would mark the launching of American military ultra-chauvinism, an era of military anti-Semitism aimed at the Jews of the United States in particular. Foreshadowing this possible development is a distinct sign appearing on October 10, 1974. General George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the top military officer of the United States, divested himself of a piece of anti-Semitism. He said in a predicting vein that "the American people might 'get tough-minded enough to set down the Jewish influence in this country and break that lobby.'" (*N.Y.T.*, March 14, 1974). And General Brown uttered the old classical canard which was used by the Black Hundred pogromists in Tsarist Russia as well as in Hitler Germany to incite the murder of Jews. He said about the Jews: "They own, you know, the banks in the country. . . ." Some banks, undoubtedly, do belong to Jews, but the overwhelming majority of the financial institutions in America are in the hands of gentiles. This is a period in the United States of pretended friendship for Israel and for the Jews in general, so active anti-Semitism must lay low. General Brown did not expect the language he used would appear in the newspaper columns. The same is true about the former President Nixon who, in speaking about arts, said, "The arts you know—they are Jews." (Cited by Edward H. Flannery in *The New York Times*, Nov. 30, 1974)

As has been said before in this work, in the two thousand years since Christianity was founded in Ancient Judea the



Jews have played the role of a permanent, traditional, historical scapegoat. Nothing happened in these twenty centuries to indicate the end of this role, and everything that happened, including the Bolshevik Revolution, shows that this role would continue as long as the world is broken up into Christian, and now also into "Communist" States.

In the middle of the Nineteenth Century a tremendous cry went up in France that the country had fallen into the hands of the Jewish bankers. The cry was raised by different people, including Karl Marx, himself of Jewish extraction, posing as a scientific Socialist, in reality a bureaucrat, a German nationalist, and an outspoken anti-Semite.

In the present era, it would be a mistake to imagine that General Brown is the only person in the upper layers of American society who thinks that the banks in America belong to the Jews. And it would be correct thinking to predict that in the event of the establishment of a military regime in the United States the Jews would be confronted with a new and yet the same old anti-Semitic plague, which Theodore Herzl had the fantasy to eliminate through the formation of the Zionist Jewish State.

The victory of American militarism over the "Communist" Russian militarism would roll back all the trade union achievements of the workers in the United States and other countries. It would induce a tremendous momentum to an unlimited in scope recoil from every ideological advance of the human species, with a different chauvinist cover from a similar reaction in the event of the victory of the "Communist" generals, calling its iron rule the restoration of American liberty.

\* \* \*

But if in the course of coming events a new view of the present world, different from the pro-Capitalist and pro-"Communist" concepts, appears on the stage of history? If an answer to the myth of a perpetual peace between the mammoth superpowers is projected into the psychology of humanity? If the men and women of an intelligence which is slanting toward rejection of a corrupt social order commence to reassess their delusions regarding the present epoch? If they realize that the whole world is in criminal hands which manipulate history not in the direction of peace and freedom but toward war and a destiny which in certain aspects would be more cruel and formidably unjust than the thousand years of almost forgotten Christian Dark and

the Middle Ages, then of what ingredients should be their political, social and economic program?

The Program can be worked out not on the built-in "rehabilitation" schemes, not on dreamed-up fantasies, not on religion-tinted utopias but, predominantly, on the closest scrutiny of the dynamic history which has led to the present taxing situation. The Program must be elaborated as a result of a dispassionate investigation of various *advanced* ideas expressed in the greatest revolutions in history.

The overthrow of Capitalism in the former Tsarist Empire was, underneath the disguised treachery in stealing power by the Lenin leadership, the most gigantic toilers' upheaval on record. By the strategy of becoming the sole and only beneficiary of that upheaval, the Russian "Communist" brigands of power, having turned almost impossible odds in their favor, first in the Civil War, and later by overwhelmingly defeating the Hitler invasion, have won the distinction of being the world rival of Capitalist imperialism, becoming imperialist themselves. Hence, as a logical culmination, there is not an inch of territory, not a square mile of the oceans, the Moscow rulers do not covet. By now they have acquired a large tract of ice-covered land in the Antarctica upon which to extend their "Socialism." They have launched the digging for oil in the Norwegian Sea. They have brought pressure to bear upon Capitalist Norway to accept "Communist" Russia as a partner in the control of the Arctic island of Spitsbergen. They are maneuvering in the Far East, in Portugal, in the Atlantic; they have secured anchorage privileges from the East Coast of Africa to India and Singapore, and this may prove consequential in seizing the globe. At the same time they brazenly protest against the design by American imperialism to construct a naval base on the British Indian Ocean island the Diego Garcia to counter their steady geographic and naval expansion.

The Program must call for combatting all imperialism, not only the Capitalist but also the "Communist." Quite a conspicuous turn in political thinking toward the correct direction was made by Dr. George Wald, Higgins Professor of Biology at Harvard in his address delivered in Tokyo on August 2, 1974 at the 20th World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bomb. The turn is contained in these momentous words: "Unless the people of this world can come together to take control of their lives, to wrest political power from those of its present masters who are pushing it toward destruction, then we are lost."



(N.Y.T., Aug. 17, 1974)

This is a great thought, well fitting into the building of a Program. Particularly illuminating is Dr. Wald's even-handed opposition to both forms of imperialism, "Communist" and Capitalist: "And what of the 'Socialist' world? It offers us an imperialism of the left to balance that of the right. . . . Hence no nation so closely resembles the United States of America as the Soviet Union."

But no momentum of these significant and true words in Dr. Wald's speech is carried forward. On the one hand he declares: "The only thing that can save us now is political power—for the peoples of this world to take that power away from their present masters, who are leading our world to destruction." On the other hand he adduces no expository results of research in the bureaucratic domineering role of "Communist" Russia, nor offers an account of the frightful armament race, nor suggests what should be the people's political power if, or when, it takes over the planet. Should it leave humanity split up into numerous States, each devoting an alarming amount of energy to the military sphere? Should the male sex, which carried on war for five thousand or more years be left in control of human affairs, with its palpably irrational approach to the problem of establishing international peace, while the female sex, a natural peace force, lives marginally, as an auxiliary to male supremacy, or should both sexes assume an equal share of responsibility for building a new, peaceful, healthy life of society?

That the Capitalist world is under the exclusively male guidance in all fields of human endeavor and activity, in the political, military, economic and social affairs of the State, is either clearly perceived or at least felt by virtually all women—and men. But the position of the female sex in the U.S.S.R. is obscured to a point of misleading the mind of the masses and of the intellectuals all over the world into believing that the women in the "Socialist" domain enjoy a measure of equality with men. They don't know that while 70 per cent of the doctors, 85 percent of the bookkeepers and accountants, and the majority of certain other professions are women, the pinnacle of medical personnel, of other occupations and pursuits, especially in administrative positions is held solidly by men. The Capitalist correspondents note the fact that there are hardly any women in the ruling apparatus: "There are five women among the 241 members of the party's Central Committee. Since the October, 1917, Bolshevik Revolution, only one woman has been a member of the

ruling inner circle known as the Politburo. There are no women in the Politburo now and none among the 92 members of the Council of Ministers." (N.Y.T., March 9, 1975)

The important omission of the Woman Question in Lenin's agitational material of 1917 was a continuation of the policy in the pre-1917 Russian Socialist movement, both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, and for that matter, basically, in the Socialist International. From the time Marx was ideologically the most influential figure in the Socialist movement it was entirely male-dominated. Lenin at no time proposed a male-female numerical equality in the administration of the future revolutionary State. Hence, even such a minor equality measure as the female franchise in Russia was advocated, after the overthrow of the monarchy, not by the Bolsheviks, or by the Mensheviks and SRs, but by the Left-bourgeois feminists, and was introduced into practice by the Capitalist Provisional Government.

Admittedly a native trait in most of the mammalian kingdom, an inseparable, guiding stimulant in the evolution of the human species, male supremacy has gradually become a staggeringly perilous form of life of humanity. Although an integral part of the evolution in the early stage in the life of homo sapiens, the supremacy of the male sex, through the growing committal of crimes by men, and the incessant male armed conflicts, is a root of decomposition, not of development, any longer, of human society.

Lenin's omission of the woman's high position in the post-Capitalist system was not the only exclusion of factors that would lead toward Socialism. Equally damaging was the general absence of the programmatic postulate on the abolition of hiring servitude. Prior to the overthrow of the Tsar, Lenin only minimally concerned himself with this issue. However, in August 1918, in pretended harmony with the unprecedented rise of revolutionary mentality of the Russian working class and in a way under the ideological stimulus of its politically advanced section, Lenin in the *Letter to the American Workers* spoke of "The newest, Capitalist hiring slavery" and even projected the idea of "War for the liberation of humanity from hiring slavery."

All the Russian Bolshevik leaders and the "Communist" leaders abroad read Lenin's 1918 *Letter to the American Workers*, but somehow they fail to notice the prevailing hiring servitude in the Capitalist world, and never cite that passage in the *Letter*. Why? Simply because Lenin took over the institution of hiring servitude and made it the foundation labor system in



his domain.

The ultra-conservatives in the Capitalist world speak out vigorously, without mincing their words, against the "Communist enslavers." The *New York Daily News*, unlike the sparklingly refined and polished *New York Times*, frequently displays a wealth of uncommonly strong appellations when speaking about the "Communists," designating them in plain language as *enslavers*! Thus: "Soviet Russia's Communist tyrants . . . Red China's slave-masters . . . Cuba's Red despot, Fidel Castro . . . these Red rats clearly are waiting with drooling anticipation for a day when we shall let our guard down far enough for them to pounce on us with solid hopes of wrecking what defenses we have left, then taking us over, killing those of us who resist, and making slaves of those who don't." (*D.N.*, Aug. 18, 1974)

These outspoken phrases reflect only a small portion of a full-length picture of slavery operating in the "Communist" countries. In an undetailed form they are expressions which do not at all imply condemnation of the hiring servitude imposed, rather inflicted, on the Russian, Chinese, Cuban and other toilers by the "Communist" enslavers, because Capitalism uses the identical system of slavery which the Capitalist ideologists fictitiously denominate as the free labor system. The *Daily News*, and similar publications, speak on behalf not of the workers but of the Capitalists exclusively as threatened with "Communist" enslavement. Indeed, were these people to present in a clear voice the burden of the concrete secret aim regarding the "Communist" States they would have undercut their own position. A reader of their declamations would perceive that their idea of freedom for the masses under the "Communist" enslavers would be the overthrow of the bureaucratic masters and the return of the toilers to the hiring servitude of private Capitalists, as that system flourishes in the United States, or in England, or in the Arab States and Israel, or even as in Franco Spain. Stripped of all verbal masking, this is the true Capitalist objective in the "liberation" of the toiling masses from "Communist" slavery.

The leaders of the "Communist," Trotskyist and related tendencies operating in the Capitalist world, most of them well-read fellows, know that the slogan "Abolition of the wage system" was introduced into the working class over a century ago. They beguile the workers with the delusion that the fundamental form of enslavement of the wage workers is the private ownership of industry. In consequence, the victims of this fabrication strug-

gle to "socialize" Capitalist economy and create a condition similar to the one established by Lenin in Russia.

The Program would have no need to put a special stress on abolition of private industry, because the emancipation of all components of society from the chains of the hiring process would automatically eliminate the hirers and the hired, the private Capitalists and the "Communist" officialdom. The emancipation of humanity from the condition *human beings for hire* would expose fully and irrevocably the denominations "Socialist world" and "Free world" as sheer frauds.

After 1918 Lenin avoided speaking again about "War for the liberation of humanity from hiring slavery" because he grew keenly aware of the fact that he was leading the Russian working class not toward liberation from hiring servitude but toward the entrenchment of that form of enslavement under the bureaucratic order. However records show that in his life he made one more reference to hiring slavery—in the Capitalist sector of humanity. The occasion was the founding of the "Communist" or Third International, early in March 1919, presided over by Lenin. Since the revolutionary workers in the Capitalist world, as well as in Russia, required a strong narcotic to render support to hiring slavery under the "Communist" masters, Lenin in a work *Third International, Its Place in History* delivered it to them: "Mankind is throwing off the last form of slavery: Capitalist or wage slavery. Emancipating itself from slavery, mankind is for the first time passing to real liberty." He knew that what he said here did not reflect the real situation in Russia or abroad. In actual development, "wage slavery," or to speak correctly, hiring servitude, was not being thrown off anywhere in the world, humanity was not passing to real liberty but moving toward stronger enslavement both in Russia and in the Capitalist world.

Chattel slavery was a living labor phenomenon in the United States while the American leaders, both in the ante-bellum North and the chattel-slave South boasted of "Sweet land of liberty" (first sung in Boston in 1832). But if the existing property in man was a violation of the spirit of liberty by the Southern slaveholders, hiring servitude has been actually an arbitrary disregard by the Capitalists of Article XIII of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, approved in 1865, which says, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude . . . shall exist within the United States. . . ." Well, hiring servitude is involuntary, although under a different form of pressure



than chattel servitude. The workers who stand at the machine all day long, engaged in performing some mechanical operation on a product, do it not because they like their work. In fact many of them are bored by it. They do it because that is the only way they can secure money with which to purchase the necessities of life. A man or woman who *must* submit himself or herself to be hired either by a private Capitalist owner of a factory or by a "Communist" director of a State-owned plant, is not a free person. Both, he and she are compelled by economic necessity to look for a job, to subject themselves to a hiring condition *in order to live*. This is a brutal, permanent fact under Capitalism and Lenin's "Communism" no matter how much the workers are mentally led by the hired agents of the Capitalist class with a deceptive notion of "free labor" or by the hiring "Communist" bosses with the fraud that the workers in the Soviet Union, who are hired to dig for oil, for gold, to produce caviar and other costly commodities for export, to make guns, tanks and planes for Syria and Egypt, to grow tobacco, represent "socialist" labor.

The Program must explain the embellishments and reforms that hiring servitude underwent in the course of the Nineteenth and the first half of the Twentieth Century. In the old sweatshop environment, the workers, dreading the horrors of unemployment, submitted to the avaricious will of the bosses and toiled eleven, twelve, some even fourteen hours a day. The Capitalists, backed by the courts, by the armed forces of their State, fought like tigers against unionization. They hired Pinkerton detectives to spy on union organizers, they hired professional scabs to break strikes. Strike leaders were imprisoned, some were killed. Labor fought desperately against sweatshop conditions which were misnamed "wage slavery," and their elimination was considered the attainment of freedom from the oppression of the Capitalists. Thus, the widespread resistance struggle of the workers went not in the direction of abolishing hiring servitude but toward its improvement. In that respect the bosses finally yielded. They acquiesced in the workers' demands to have the right to form unions, to shorten the work day, to introduce various reforms in the conditions of work. There was established between the Capitalists and the trade union leaders an unspoken understanding that, in return, the unions would safeguard and uphold the hiring system, and render support to the Capitalist State in its application of various policies at home and abroad. The height of Capitalist reforms of hiring servitude

was reached under Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. But whether it is sugar-coated with unemployment insurance, pensions, social security and other valuable benefits, whether the designation for payment to the hired person is "remuneration," "compensation," "emolument," "stipend," "salary," "fee" or plain wages the hiring system is still a state and a stain of condition of enthrallment.

The Program would have to advance beyond the old, quite inadequate formula "Elimination of wage slavery" because Lenin, in removing the Capitalist class from control of the economy, a class which is not for hire, and replacing it with a bureaucracy, a social element itself functioning as a hired stratum, gave the hiring system he inaugurated a strong anti-Capitalist flavor. This calls for the elimination of both the Capitalist and the anti-Capitalist hiring principle in its entirety, beginning at bottom with its fundamental, *labor* aspect, to the highest levels of both societies, the Capitalist bank presidents, industrial executives, who are not hired but "elected" to their offices, their politicians, and the "Communist" Ministers who officially receive a modest pay, as in the case of Stalin, but who help themselves freely to the State wealth by virtue of their control of the levers of administration, or even through plain stealing. Thievery among the "Communist" officials has been common and very seldom punishable since the Lenin period. For example, the only woman in the Khrushchev-Brezhnev Cabinets, Yekaterine Furtseva, stole a large sum of money to build a lavish dacha for her daughter. When she was caught, only the personal intervention by Brezhnev saved her from punishment. He retained her as the Minister of Culture. (*N.Y.T.*, Oct. 26, 1974)

The chattel nightmare plagued humanity for many thousands of years. Its economic and moral validity as a social institution went unquestioned by all the known poets, artists, physicians, philosophers, explorers, priests, politicians. Aristotle, Socrates, Plato fully accepted chattel slavery, and so did the priests of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. And a little over a hundred years ago, in one of the most advanced and enlightened countries in history, in the United States of America the chattel employment of human labor was a system sanctioned by law, and with the owners of plantations even a respectable practice. Had the founders of this State abolished chattel slavery, there would have been no Civil War in America. As it was, the Southern aristocrats fought frantically to retain it. But even before the



Civil War, but especially after, the surge of abhorrence of that institution worked such a profound change in social consciousness that today to put the yoke of chattel bondage on a human being is recognized almost universally as a punishable, detestable crime.

Hence the Program would indicate that the general rise of detestation of the principle of hiring human beings for labor purposes, for office work, or even of nominal nature, would constitute an important, culminating factor in securing the abolition of this form of life of the homo sapiens.

In exposing various facets of the Capitalist and "Communist" hiring systems the Program would show the profound distinction in the ideological chains that attach the workers in both worlds to their enslavement. An honest American worker, supporting Capitalism, says, "I love America! Communism be damned! This is a free country! I can say what I think. I can join the union. I can go on strike. I can vote for whomever I choose, or not vote at all. I can criticize the President. Try in Russia to say one word about the leader—away to Siberia you go. I can travel to Mexico, to Canada, to Europe, and nobody can stop me." An honest Soviet worker supporter of the bureaucratic order recites, "This is my land, the land of Socialism, and I will give my life to fight for it. Shortcomings and difficulties may arise, but they will be overcome as we reach the higher phase of Communism."

Both workers do not realize, of course, that they are hired slaves, one of the Capitalists, the other of the "Communist" bureaucracy. But the motivation that prompts each to take his specific position is vastly different one from the other. The "Communist" story since Lenin stole power from the Second Soviet Congress and lied, "Now we will proceed to build the Socialist order," and to the present day, is a classic case of ideological intoxication, a narcotic covering enslavement and oppression to a point of acceptance of senseless tyranny. The Capitalist-based freedoms, on the other hand, are concrete factors of life in a bourgeois-democratic society. Capitalist democracy was intended to be used, and has been used by the financiers, industrialists and merchants in their class interests. But they are powerless to prevent its utilization in the process of advancing of society from Capitalism to authentic Socialism, as they are powerless to bar the "Communists" from putting out the pro-Moscow or pro-Peking press, or participate in elections—unless a Fascist regime replaces Capitalist democracy. Free-

dom of speech, freedom of the written word, of dissent, are great freedoms, which were paid for with much blood in the Capitalist revolutions against Feudal kings and the nobility. The obvious savage threats to those freedoms come from the Fascists and the "Communists," who manipulate Capitalist democracy before securing power, and ruthlessly crush these freedoms after they become masters of the realm. The Program would introduce the proposition that authentic Socialism would cherish and preserve these precious rights, secured on the road toward liberation of humanity from all oppression and enslavement.

The Program would take up the problem of compensating an individual for his or her contribution of energy to social economy under a genuine Socialist system. Before 1917 few ideas were more ludicrous to the Capitalist intellectual than the notion passing as plans for distribution of commodities in Socialist society. The thought of abolition of the monetary system, which is the bedrock of distribution of commodities in all exploiting societies, is incomprehensible to the Capitalist mind. Exactly so, in the former centuries, to a slaveowner who was fiercely devoted to the maintenance of the chattel institution, the ending of the ownership of human beings by other members of the same species was inconceivable. But in 1917, before the overthrow of the Capitalist authority, Lenin spoke of a "work book" to be applied in Russia with the establishment of a Soviet power.

At Bolshevik meetings and official gatherings in the early period of Lenin's regime, correct ideas, plans and whole resolutions were numerous. In March 1919, at the Eighth Party Congress a resolution was adopted which said without any ambiguity: "The Russian Communist Party tends to adopt a series of measures which widen the sphere of moneyless accounting and prepare for the abolition of money."

Not only the Oppositionists but all the Leninists voted for this resolution. There was not a single voice expressing the opinion that the plan to adopt a moneyless system was a plain utopia. But this resolution, proposing to lay one of the foundation stones of Socialism, was lost on the way Russia was moving, led by the renegade group of leaders under Lenin. It was he who took the initiative to stifle it. About two months after the adoption of this resolution, without a single opposing vote, Lenin came out with a quite open statement about the intrinsic significance of money: "Money is a note for receiving tribute from all toilers, it is a remnant of yesterday's exploitation . . . very many technical and, what is much more difficult and important, organizational



conquests are required in order to abolish money, and until then it cannot be helped but to have equality in words, in the Constitution, and have the situation whereas everyone who has money has a factual right to exploitation." (Speech, May 6, 1919, at the Congress on Extra-School Education, Works, Rus. Ed. XXIX, 329)

Lenin thus safeguarded the exploiting position of his bureaucracy. Many Oppositionists protested his pro-exploitation line and intensified their struggle against the expanding bureaucratism. But the majority of the revolutionary workers in 1919 trusted Lenin. They had to be patient and wait until "organizational conquests" when, as Lenin promised again and again, the bureaucracy would be eliminated, and with it the use of money.

The Program answering the SALT delusion would present a plan to abolish all exploitation through the abolition of money, in a sense much less complex than the construction of the mechanism through which men were sent to the moon.

Upon laying the foundation bed for Socialism by removing hiring servitude, male supremacy, the Capitalist and the "Communist" bureaucrats, money, and the rest of the accessories and adornments of exploitation, humanity would choose representation of all nations to a World Council for the purpose of launching one united international State. This entirely new formation, most unusual in the evolution of humanity, would bear no resemblance to the Roman Empire, which was erected on chattel slavery, or to the British Empire, constructed on the basis of hiring servitude. It would be the direct opposite from the Capitalist-"Communist" so-called "United Nations."

And speaking of the "United Nations," what is the political essence of that body? In general, it is a talk shop. In specific critical situations which give off sparks of criminality, it acts as an obfuscator of hard reality, usually playing a stand-off role. A clear example is its attitude to the American involvement in the Vietnam war. All the visible and not so visible concrete signs carried the gist of the fact that the United States conducted for ten years, more or less, a policy *not* to win the war, but to stretch it out for as long a period of time as it could. The American forces, a half million strong, skirmished all over the place, avoiding the invasion of North Vietnam, refraining for many years from mining the Haifong harbor, the claim being made that the mining would have involved a confrontation with the Russians. But the fundamental attitude of the Russians toward American embroilment in Vietnam was ultra-pacific. Yet,

in arguments, people pointed warningly to the Russians. Insofar as the Russians were concerned "they did tolerate the roughest American measures of military escalation: the expansion of the war into Cambodia, the mining of Haifong harbor, the bombing of Hanoi." (Anthony Lewis, *N.Y.T.*, Feb. 13, 1975)

The substance of the part the United States played in the Vietnam military situation was that the war gradually became a tremendous market for the American munition manufacturers and of allied equipment of war to the sum of over a hundred billion dollars much of which the United States Government collected from the American taxpayers and passed into the coffers of the merchants of instruments of mass death. For them the war turned into the goose that was laying mountains of golden eggs. Robert Sherrill, a reviewer for *The New York Times* of Gerard Colby Zilg's book *Behind the Nylon Curtain*, a history of the Du Ponts, an allpowerful family, biggest producers of powder, participants in the making of the atomic bomb and makers of other war material, writes: "The Du Ponts had some of their most profitable years during the Vietnam War, and Zilg thinks their good fortune might at one point have been tied to the fact that a former Du Pont lobbyist, Clark Clifford, was Defense Secretary." (*Book Review*, *N.Y.T.*, Dec. 15, 1974)

The excuse for not mining the harbor of Haifong used for many years, but finally dropped, on dissection, stands out as a crude fraud rich with revealing loopholes. Haifong, after all, is a North Vietnamese port. American airmen invaded the skies over most of North Vietnam, destroying Russian munition dumps, Russian tanks and Russian artillery, which arrived via Haifong, thus compelling Moscow constantly to replenish Hanoi's war equipment. The extraordinary freedom of passage of "Communist" ships to that port told of the Capitalist war profiteering game and the "Communist" prestige game the two superpowers played quite cheerfully in Vietnam. They convulsed the small strip of land with the agony of a ubiquitous demolition. Millions of its terrorized population were turned into ragged, starving, bleeding refugees, millions of women into prostitutes, used by a handful of native merchants, officials and army officers as well as by American soldiers, millions of children into orphans, millions into untimely corpses. It was not a civil war in conventional sense but a Washington-Moscow directed tragedy in which almost the entire population of a tiny country was put to the rack, facilitating by that cruel strategy the disposal of mountains of war equipment by the American merchants



of death.

And while Washington and Moscow were tearing the country to shreds with their planes and artillery, inflicting an agonizing nightmare on the population, their representatives were meeting in different cities on the globe, shook hands, patted each other on the back, and with hypocritical friendly smiles on their faces discussed mutual trade, cultural exchanges, cooperation in science, and above all peace, not peace in Vietnam but in the world, that is, peace between themselves. Never in history has there been such a revoltingly cynical spectacle as was presented by Washington and Moscow to the world, and particularly to their tortured victim, the Vietnamese people.

In the opening phase of the Vietnam war, the American masses and intellectuals of the pro-Capitalist world were not concerned with the conflict. But as it grew, the majority of the population began to dislike the involvement in it. Gradually the dislike, through the cumulative process of casualties of senseless brutalities, turned into a feeling of opposition to the war policy of the Administration. "Everything is going with the Administration's war except the majority of the people," wrote James Reston. (*N.Y.T.*, Nov. 17, 1967)

If in 1967, when Reston wrote the above remark, the majority of the United States population was not supporting the war policy of the Government, then, several years later, even a vaster majority was opposed to that lengthy, brutal and utterly inconclusive conflict. In the field were several organizations calling for stopping the war. They comprised the "Peace Movement."

A true peace movement would operate under slogans directed against the corrupt leaders on both sides in the Vietnam war: "No Confidence in Washington, Moscow and Peking! No Victory for Either Hanoi or Saigon! For the Fraternization of the Soldiers of Both Camps Against the Puppets of American and Russian Imperialism! Expose the War Profiteers Who Grow Fat on Vietnam Blood!"

That would be an approximation to Lenin's line against the war in 1917 before he swindled power from the Congress of Soviets, before he disrupted the great fraternization of the Russian and the German soldiers, before he became a treacherous, scheming and conniving renegade. That line, an attack on both Russian and German imperialists in 1917, turned the toiling population of Russia away from the Mensheviks and SRs, who supported Kerensky's war policy, toward the Bolsheviks.

The condemnation of the Vietnam policy of Washington and

of Moscow, the call for fraternization, would have won the support of the vast majority of the people of the United States, and the Government would have been pressed to withdraw from the bloody affair years sooner than it did. But the "Peace Movement" in the field, inspired, influenced and manipulated behind the open stage by the local "Communist" bureaucrats, under the Kremlin's distant guidance, kept the Russian masters well protected with complete silence, and consistently and loudly supported the war on the side of the Hanoi flunkies of Moscow. The coalition members—groups participating in the "anti-war" marches and demonstrations, from Left-Capitalist intellectuals, whose humane cry of their hearts beclouded their political eyes, to the wild, ultra-adventurist youths who copied some of the Moscow methods of action for "peace." In Moscow mobs of "peace" hooligans, naturally directed by the authorities, threw stones at the windows of the United States Embassy to show the Russian masses that there was a movement inside the Soviet Union opposed to American presence in Vietnam. In New York and other American cities the "peace" hooligans tore or burned the American flag, shouted for the victory of the "Communist" side in Vietnam, and carried out various antics provocative to the anti-"Communist" American masses. The anti-war majority of the American population turned its back on the "Peace Movement" and its face toward Senators and Congressmen who, as years went by, had to show action. The decision was made by the Nixon Government to withdraw the half million American soldiers and close the physical participation of the United States in the affair. But the shipping of war supplies to Saigon went on. When Saigon surrendered, the columnist Jack Anderson wrote: "The Communists have also captured millions of dollars worth of planes, tanks, artillery, rifles, tons of ammunition, spare parts and sophisticated electronics equipment. By the time they complete the inevitable, total conquest of Vietnam, they will own one of the world's most formidable weapons stockpiles—all courtesy of the American taxpayers." (*New York Post*, April 29, 1975)

Never in the history of all wars, of the World War of 1914-18, of the so-called "Second World War," did the producer of military hardware do as well as in the Vietnam adventure, thanks in part to the pro-Moscow "Peace Movement."

In the United Nations, both the Capitalists and "Communists" refrained from even attempting to liquidate the Vietnam tragedy, which carried no prospect of freedom to the toiling



masses, whether the victory went to Saigon or to Hanoi. So what is the United Nations in the final analysis? It is a cloak for the frightful traffic in arms, for the oppression and exploitation of both social systems, and a cover for the two superpowers in their intrigues and secret diplomacy.

To get back from this review of the Vietnamese blood-and-dirt adventure of the Du Ponts and other dealers in war equipment to that part of the Program which takes up the problem of constructing a united international State after the removal of "Communism" and Capitalism. The duly elected representatives of the peoples of the world, men and women, would gather at some geographical point, even perhaps at Geneva, to organize the foundation for their global body. The first principle of the new State would be that it be based upon *numerical equality* of men and women in the administration personnel, from top to bottom. Next, each official would be chosen to function for a specific, short term, not as in "Communist" countries where a dictator "elects" himself for life, or in a Capitalist-democratic State in which a politician elected by a machine of a Capitalist party holds his office ten, twenty, thirty years, and is reelected again and again, until he dies. And during his tenure he contributes a bone here and a bone there, of his labors, a little to the workers, a little to the aged, a little to the women, but his main energies to the oil, tobacco, cotton, steel and other trusts, and primarily to the financial interests and the manufacturers of armaments.

The single international State, replacing the multi-State, armed to the teeth, inflammable world, would remove all boundaries separating the nations. It would put an end to the two-thousand-year political plague of anti-Semitism. In a world without masters and exploiters, without borders, a Jew would cease being a member of a scapegoat national group, and would be a citizen equal with others no matter where he lived.

Needless to argue, a world State, embracing the entire human species, would require no nuclear bombs, no artillery, no air force, no warships. Unlike the fraudulent policy of SALT, the policy of disarmament conducted by the world State would be the embodiment of the age-old hope of the toiling masses, who suffer most during the war, of intellectual idealists and peace dreamers, for universal peace. Exposing the Capitalist and the "Communist" talk about the possibility of controlling the armament race in a multi-State masculine jungle of human existence, as either a delusion or more likely, a deliberate fraud, the global

bi-sexual State immediately upon its formation, would liquidate all armies and navies, and above all, would directly dismantle all the vast accumulations of nuclear weaponry. Thus, the international State would become a beacon lighting humanity's way out of the ten-thousand-year or longer night of bloody strife among tribes, kingdoms and huge empires toward the bright day of Socialism.

The global State would address itself to the problem of maintaining the health of the world population. A tremendous amount of resources, equal in aggregate sum to that spent by the Capitalist and the "Communist" powers on armaments, would be laid out for research in fighting cancer and other seemingly incurable diseases. Among preventive actions, the State would discontinue the cultivation of opium, tobacco and other poison plants designed under Capitalism and "Communism" for inducing popular stupor or artificial stimulation—except a limited crop for medicinal purposes.

With the transformation of the social institutions, crime would rapidly decline and reach the vanishing point. One of the most significant inducements to robbery, burglary, muggings, swindling of all sorts, is the monetary system. Lenin, in his frank admission that the "Communist" system is exploiting by nature, called money a certificate of "exploitation." But money has many other aspects. Money is a propelling factor of corruption in both Capitalist and "Communist" societies, corruption in sex relations, in marriage and in prostitution, in virtually all avenues of human activity particularly in the bureaucratic structure of the State machinery. For money people resort to theft, to swindling, to self-abasement, robbery, even to murder. Money is an important engine of war. Money holds in its filthy grip the whole human race. Without abolishing money humanity can never abolish not only exploitation and war but also ordinary street crime. Piracy was swept off the Caribbean and other seas not through the severe punishment, by the quartering and hanging of the pirates, but in the course of the advancement of the technique and volume of navigation.

The Program would make a special point of warning against allowing the political leaders of the toiling masses to take control of the levers of the State. They must develop and hold the view that leaders must shun office-holding as a plague. They must act as guides, as advisers, as organizers, but never as "premiers," as "Chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars." If they take administrative power, they themselves with all possible



speed become enslavers and oppressors. In the uprisings of the Ancient chattel slaves led by Spartacus and others, in the insurrections of the chattel slaves and serfs in the Feudal centuries, of workers in the Capitalist era, specifically in the Paris Commune of 1871, the leaders with their shift to assuming power, became dictators, weighing down upon the lower ranks, overwhelming them with oppression, constricting them into thralldom, sometimes worse than the one just overthrown, as in the case of Stalin's terrible personal despotism. All the pre-1917 risings were crushed, not given enough time to develop a clear practical experiment of several years' duration to verify that in the chief's minds was usually lurking, inextricably interwoven with their seemingly dedicated struggle to liberate the toilers from the chattel masters, from serfdom, from the exploitation by the Capitalists, a vague craving for personal exercise of power. Lenin was the first in history who, upon establishing his administrative control, acted out this experiment.

The Program, finally, would suggest another tremendous task. It would point out that while the objectively studied origin of homo sapiens millions of years back is scientifically valid—or maybe not—the history of the last few thousand years is nebulous, religiously colored, polluted with fabrications, with part-truths, part-inventions, or sheerest, deliberate falsifications. It has been written to glow with heroic male military charm to suit the upper crust of the ruling oppressors. All the hitherto written official history, to the extent that is possible, must be cleansed and purified, and authentic data made available to humanity.

This in brief would be the answer to the male usurpers in Russia, who are building frantically a mountain of nuclear weapons, to the other "Communist" tyrants, those of China, Cuba, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, East Germany, North Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, to the adventurers at the head of the huge "Communist" parties in Italy, France and other Capitalist countries, all those who either secured State control or achieved the leadership over millions of workers in the Capitalist world only because the Capitalists Fascists and the democratic Capitalists militarily failed to materialize in "Communist" Russia the Munich plot. It would be an answer to the Gargantuan American bankers and munition makers who are feverishly accumulating in the United States, in Europe, in Asia, and on the oceans huge stockpiles of monstrous instruments of mass murder, thousands of times

more destructive than the bombs President Truman used to burn Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

And it would be an answer to the deeply concerned workers, to the thinking women, to the honest bourgeois intellectuals whose political perception finds itself currently in a blind alley. Consistent with the fact that Solzhenitsyn and other Soviet dissidents have a first-hand knowledge of the "Communist" horrors, and the intellectuals in the Capitalist countries are well familiar with the highly obnoxious and dreadful aspects of Capitalism, it would seem that out of these quarters people would come to the fore with ideas indicating they are at least groping toward this Program. Unfortunately this is not the case. The Left intellectuals in the Capitalist countries are captives of the "Communist," or Trotskyist or Socialist parties, while the Russian intellectuals in general simply do not think politically—"the intelligentsia, many of whose members seem more interested in the latest Western fashions than in dissident ideas." (N.Y.T., Dec. 23, 1974)

The handful of Soviet dissidents "whose ranks have been thinned by the official decision to exile some of the more prominent dissidents" (*Ibid.*), their vision, politically obscured by the walls of their environment, do not constitute a threat to the State hierarchy. Thus, Solzhenitsyn advises the men at the helm, who are corrupted by power in every fiber of their brains:

"Allow freedom in the arts, in literature, the freedom to publish, not political books—God forbid!—not appeals or election leaflets, but philosophical, ethical, economic and sociological works. All this will yield a rich harvest, it will bear fruit—for Russia, and for you, too, and you will be serving the interests of Russia." (Cited in *The New York Times*, March 3, 1974)

This naive, though sincere appeal is matched by other leaders of the dissidents, Andrei Sakharov, Roy Medvedev and Valery Turchin in their letter of solicitation to the ruling gang. The meat of their theses consists of two points. One is on the war preparations of the two superpowers: "We take the opportunity to express our opinion that it is urgent and advisable for the nuclear powers to make unilateral and joint declarations of principle that they will not be the first to use weapons of mass destruction." (Cited in *Samizdat*, 411). The second point is a suggestion to democratize the Soviet Union: "Democratization, carried out under the leadership of the CPSU [Communist Party of the Soviet Union] in collaboration with all strata of society, should maintain and strengthen the leading role of the



party in the economic, political and cultural life of society." (400). Extensive comments are unnecessary. The first point holds on to the delusion about treaties and declarations, the second would sound a little more than a joke if it weren't so deeply tragic.

What a difference between the old fighters in the Bolshevik Party for workers democracy, the Workers Opposition led by Kollontai and Shliapnikov, by the Democratic Centralists guided by Sapronov, and the present-day dissidents! The old Oppositionists did not appeal to the powerful upper stratum of leaders. They addressed the rank and file of the Communist Party. Supported by a considerable number of these soldiers of workers democracy, they bitterly fought Lenin, even to the point of describing him as the biggest of all bureaucrats, even to the extent of comparing him to the head of a rotting fish—the putrefying Bolshevik Party—and in the passion that inflamed the struggle, went even further than that. Oppositionist Ignatov, retorting to a brutal affirmation by a supporter of Lenin that the Opposition would be expelled from the Party, dropped a remark the sense of which, incredibly enough, was that the people to be expelled should be those who disregarded the anti-bureaucratic resolution of a previous Party gathering. This clearly pointed at Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, and the rest of the top Bolshevik leaders. That was a formidable challenge. (*Sten. Rep. of the Tenth Party Congress*, in Russian, 175). The current Soviet dissidents who are seeking to persuade the arrogant vice to act as a virtue are the most passive honest oppositionists in the history of Bolshevik Russia.

But harmless to the ruling top as they are they are hounded by Brezhnev's political police with the intention to wipe them out. Sakharov has not been arrested yet, but he is being cruelly punished indirectly. His wife has been slowly going blind. In the fall of 1974 she applied to go to Italy for medical treatment. The authorities rejected her application. "Mrs. Sakharov, who is 52 years old, suffered eye injuries while serving as an army nurse during World War II and is classified as a disabled veteran . . . She said she expected to lose her remaining sight within six months . . . an official told her the visa request had been turned down because no Soviet citizen could go to a Western country without an invitation from a relative. He suggested that Mrs. Sakharov apply again in a year." (*N.Y.T.*, March 25, 1975)

Her case brings to mind the case of a Soviet diplomat, Adolf Joffe, a very sick man, who was punished for being a friend of

Trotsky's by having his medicine withheld from him by Stalin's orders. Joffe committed suicide on November 16, 1927.

\* \* \*

The dynamic force contained in the revolutionary answer to the delusion of SALT is locked in obscurity and may never see the dawn of its day. In the present political atmosphere of intensive maneuvering by the two big and many small powers this sweeping answer is at an immeasurable distance from the stage of history. It can be likened to a far-away, barely visible quasar in the infinite, eternal space. Today the center of the stage is occupied, to the detriment of real peace and real freedom, by the two superpowers. They opened the present period with the detente and the SALT. The detente was launched with a bright promise of a new, rosy social horizon. It has grown into a bitter disappointment to many of the prospective tenants in its air castles after the Russian "Communists" drew back on the agreement about emigration of entrapped peoples of the Soviet Union, specifically Jews. But the leaders of the two superpowers have not finished performing, with the most serious mien, in the patently deceptive twosome in the SALT. Professing to patrol the world for peace, while shipping into almost every country on earth stupendous cargoes of military equipment, and conducting high-flown diplomatic gyrations, they promulgate not peace but war among the lesser States. Informed by their marvellously developed intelligence systems, they possess an intimate insight into each other's heavily-stocked nuclear arsenals. With a colossal striking power at their fingertips, concealing their long-sought goal of destroying each other, governed by political and military imperatives, the two superpowers, approaching the peak of concentration of strength and vigor, are laying down the strategic ground for the "shoot first" pushing of the fatal button to effect the awesome denouement of the deadly delusion of the SALT. To the impressive catalogue of crimes committed by the Ancient Romans and by the slaveholders before and after them, by the kings, the lords of the Feudal Era, by the unholy men of the Holy Inquisition, by the slave-merchants carrying living human beings across the Atlantic from Africa to feed the maw of the ugliest institution in the evolutionary process operating in the most beautiful land of "liberty," by the arch-murderers Stalin and Hitler whose intrigues cost the lives of 30 million Soviet masses, ten million German, six million Jews, by the Washington-Moscow tormentors of the victimized Vietnamese people, would be added



one more grim bestiality, one more frightful atrocity, the ghastliest of all. Its cost in human lives would be over 200 million, destroyed in a matter of minutes. It would be perpetrated either by a small number of Capitalist males, perched, like vultures, at the apex of high finance and the mighty armament industry, or by the top-ranking Russian "Communist" enslavers, also all males, standing on a mountain of bone-chilling outrages, carried out, since Lenin stole State power, not only against the dislodged and crushed Capitalists and aristocrats, not only against the Jews, the Letts, the Tartars, and other minority nationalities, but also against their own brethren-leaders of the newly-emerged criminal element in history, the Russian "Communist" bureaucracy.

July 1975

George Spiro

New York, N.Y.

OLIN C. BAILEY LIBRARY  
HENDRIX COLLEGE  
CONWAY, ARKANSAS 72032